STATE FISCAL STABILIZATION FUND PHASE II APPLICATION
PART 1: APPLICATION COVER SHEET
(CFDA No. 84.394)

Legal Name of Applicant (Office of the Governor):	Applicant's Mailing Address:
Office of the Governor, State of Michigan	111 S. Capitol P.O. Box 30013 Lansing, Michigan 48909

State Contact for the Education Stabilization Fund

Name: Beth Bingham

Position and Office: Director, Economic Recovery Office

Contact's Mailing Address:

111 S. Capitol
P.O. Box 30013
Lansing, MI 48909

Telephone: (517) 373-0200

Fax: (517) 241-5657

E-mail address: BinghamE@michigan.gov

To the best of my knowledge and belief, all of the information and data in this application are true and correct.

Governor or Authorized Representative of the Governor (Printed Name): Governor Jennifer M. Granholm	Telephone: (517) 373-3400
Signature of Governor or Authorized Representative of the Governor: X [signature]	Date: 3/3/10

Recommended Statement of Support from the Chief State School Officer *(Optional)*:
The State educational agency will cooperate with the Governor in the implementation of the State Fiscal Stabilization Fund program.

Chief State School Officer (Printed Name): __Michael P. Flanagan__	Telephone: (517) 373-9235
Signature of the Chief State School Officer: X [signature]	Date: 3/3/10

PART 2A: UPDATE OF MAINTENANCE-OF-EFFORT DATA

1. **Levels of State support for elementary and secondary education** *(the amounts may reflect the levels of State support on either an aggregate basis or a per-student basis):*

   FY 2006 **$ 6,669.00 per pupil**

   FY 2009 **$ 6,821.00 per pupil**

   FY 2010* **$ 6,744.00** per pupil**

   FY 2011* **$ 6,775.00** per pupil**

   (* Provide data to the extent that data are currently available.)
   (** Estimates based on enacted legislation for FY10 and current revenue estimates for FY11; subject to change.)

2. **Levels of State support for public institutions of higher education** *(enter amounts for each year)*:

   FY 2006 **$ 1,670,532,950**

   FY 2009 **$ 1,734,416,958**

   FY 2010* **$ 1,677,816,822****

   FY 2011* **$ 1,728,454,112****

   (* Provide data to the extent that data are currently available.)
   (** Estimates based on enacted legislation for FY10 and a maintenance budget for FY11; subject to change.)

3. **Additional Submission Requirements**: In an attachment to the application –

   (a) Identify and describe the data sources used in determining the levels of State support for elementary and secondary education; (See Attachment A)

   - and -

   (b) Identify and describe the data sources used in determining the levels of State support for public IHEs. (See Attachment A)

PART 2B: ATTESTATION OF MAINTENANCE-OF-EFFORT COMPLIANCE

The Governor or his/her authorized representative attests to the following:

To the best of his/her knowledge and based on the best available data, the State has met all maintenance-of-effort requirements for the State Fiscal Stabilization Program for FY 2009 (check all that apply):

X for elementary and secondary education.

X for public Institutions of Higher Education (IHEs).

Governor or Authorized Representative of the Governor (Printed Name):	
Governor Jennifer M. Granholm	
Signature:	Date: 3/3/10

<u>If a State has not met or cannot meet MOE for either elementary and secondary education or public IHEs, or both, it must complete the following:</u>

The State has not met all maintenance-of-effort requirements for the State Fiscal Stabilization Program for FY 2009 and

(check one):

☐ has already submitted a MOE Waiver Request to the US Department of Education.

☐ is submitting a MOE Waiver Request with this application package.

I. Assurance (a): Achieving Equity in Teacher Distribution

A State must collect and publicly report data and other information on: (1) the extent that students in high- and low-poverty schools in the State have access to highly qualified teachers; (2) the extent that current strategies and efforts to address inequities in the distribution of inexperienced, unqualified, or out-of-field teachers; (3) how teacher and principal performance is evaluated and how performance ratings are used; and (4) the distribution of performance evaluation ratings or levels among teachers and principals.

Indicator (a)(1)	**Confirm, for the State, the number and percentage (including numerator and denominator) of core academic courses taught, in the highest-poverty and lowest-poverty schools, by teachers who are highly qualified consistent with section 9101(23) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended (ESEA).**

Please respond (Yes or No): Are the data related to this indicator at http://www.ed.gov/programs/statestabilization/indicator-a1.xls correct?

[1] ☐ Yes, the data are correct.

[2] ☒ No, the data are not correct.

If checked, provide below or in an attachment the correct data and any supporting information. A URL linking to the correct data on the State's website is also sufficient:[3] Click here to enter text.

Please respond (check only one):

[4] ☒ The State makes the data *publicly available* and updates the data *annually* on a website.

➔ Provide the State website where the data are provided by the State to the public:[5]
http://www.michigan.gov/documents/cepi/2008_Fall_equitable_dist_312643_7.pdf

From the CEPI Web site (www.michigan.gov/cepi):

1. From the left side navigation, select "data and reports"
2. From the left side navigation, select "school personnel"
3. At the center of the page, there is a Microsoft Excel Spreadsheet entitled "Fall 2008 Equitable Distribution Report"

[6] ☐ The State makes the data *publicly available* on a website but updates it *less than annually*.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the data publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (a)(1)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

Provide the State website where the most recently updated data are provided by the State to the public: [7] Click here to enter text.

[8] ☐ The State does not make the data publicly available on a website.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the data publicly available and updating the data annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (a)(1)" in the Plan Element Verification chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark both the Collection and Public Reporting columns.

Indicator (a)(2)	Confirm whether the State’s Teacher Equity Plan (as part of the State’s Highly Qualified Teacher Plan) fully reflects the steps the State is currently taking to ensure that students from low-income families and minority students are not taught at higher rates than other students by inexperienced, unqualified, or out-of-field teachers (as required in section 1111(b)(8)(C) of the ESEA).

Please respond (Yes or No): Is the State’s Teacher Equity Plan located at http://www.ed.gov/programs/teacherqual/hqtplans/index.html correct?

[1] ☒ Yes, the information is correct.

[2] ☐ No, the information is not correct.

- ➔ If checked, provide below or in an attachment the State’s most updated Teacher Equity Plan. A URL linking to the correct data on the State’s website is also sufficient:[3] Click here to enter text.

Please respond (check only one):

[4] ☒ The State makes the information *publicly available* and updates the information *annually* on a website. http://www.michigan.gov/mde-hq

- ➔ Provide the State website where the information is provided by the State to the public:[5] http://www.michigan.gov/documents/mde/Michigan_Teacher_Equity_Plan2_112906_225500_7.doc

[6] ☐ The State makes the information *publicly available* on a website but updates it *less than annually*.

- ➔ Provide the State’s plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 2B. Cite “Indicator (a)(2)” in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.
- ➔ Provide the State website where the most recently updated information is provided by the State to the public:[7] Click here to enter text.

[8] ☐ The State does not make the information publicly available on a website.

Provide the State’s plan for making the information publicly available and updating the information annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite “Indicator (a)(2)” in the Plan Element Verification chart in Part 4B, Section I and mark both the Collection and Public Reporting columns.

Descriptor (a)(1)	Describe, for each local educational agency (LEA) in the State, the systems used to evaluate the performance of teachers and the use of results from those systems in decisions regarding teacher development, compensation, promotion, retention, and removal.

Please respond (check Yes or No): Does the State collect a description of the system each LEA uses to evaluate the performance of teachers?

[1] ☐ Yes, the State collects this information.

If Yes, please respond (check one):

[2] ☐ The State makes the information *publicly available* and updates the information *at least annually* on a website.

➔ Provide the State website where the information is collected and publicly available:[3] Click here to enter text.

[4] ☐ The State makes the information *publicly available* on a website and updates the information *less than annually*.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Descriptor (a)(1)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

➔ Provide the State website where the most recently updated information are provided by the State to the public: [5] Click here to enter text.

[6] ☐ The State does not make the information publicly available on a website.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Descriptor (a)(1)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

[7] ☒ No, the State does not collect this information.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Descriptor (a)(1)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark both the Collection and Public Reporting columns.

Please respond (check Yes or No): Does the State collect a description of the manner in which each LEA uses the results of the evaluation systems described above related to the performance of teachers in decisions regarding teacher development, compensation, promotion, retention, and removal?

[8] ☐ Yes, the State collects this information.

If Yes, please respond (check one):

[9] ☐ The State makes the information *publicly available* and updates the information *at least annually* on a website.

➔ Provide the State website where the information is collected and publicly available:[10] Click here to enter text.

[11] ☐ The State makes the information *publicly available* on a website and updates the information *less than annually*.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Descriptor (a)(1)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

Provide the State website where the most recently updated information are provided by the State to the public: [12] Click here to enter text.

[13] ☐ The State does not make the information publicly available on a website.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Descriptor (a)(1)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

[14] ☒ No, the State does not collect this information.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Descriptor (a)(1)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark both the Collection and Public Reporting columns.

Indicator (a)(3)	Indicate, for each LEA in the State, whether the systems used to evaluate the performance of teachers include student achievement outcomes or student growth data as an evaluation criterion.

Please respond (check Yes or No): Does the State request information on whether the system each LEA uses to evaluate the performance of teachers includes student achievement outcomes or student growth data as an evaluation criterion?

[1] ☐ Yes, the State collects this information.

If Yes, please respond (check one):

[2] ☐ The State makes the information *publicly available* and updates the information *at least annually* on a website.

➔ Provide the State website where the information is collected and publicly available:[3] Click here to enter text.

[4] ☐ The State makes the information *publicly available* on a website and updates the information *less than annually*.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (a)(3)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

➔ Provide the State website where the most recently updated information is provided by the State to the public: [5] Click here to enter text.

[6] ☐ The State does not make the information publicly available on a website.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (a)(3)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

[7] ☒ No, the State does not collect this information.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (a)(3)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark both the Collection and Public Reporting columns.

Indicator (a)(4)	Provide, for each LEA in the State whose teachers receive performance ratings or levels through an evaluation system, the number and percentage (including numerator and denominator) of teachers rated at each performance rating or level.

Please respond (check Yes or No): Does the State collect, for each LEA in the State whose teachers receive performance ratings or levels through an evaluation system, the number and percentage of teachers rated at each performance rating or level?

1 ☐ Yes, the State collects these data.

If Yes, please respond (check one):

2 ☐ The State makes the data *publicly available* and updates the data *at least annually* on a website.

➔ Provide the State website where the data are collected and publicly available:3 Click here to enter text.

4 ☐ The State makes the data *publicly available* on a website and updates the data *less than annually*.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the data publicly available and updating the data annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (a)(4)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

➔ Provide the State website where the most recently updated data are provided by the State to the public:
5 Click here to enter text.

6 ☐ The State does not make the data publicly available on a website.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the data publicly available and updating the data annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (a)(4)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

7 ☒ No, the State does not collect these data.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the data publicly available and updating the data annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (a)(4)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark both the Collection and Public Reporting columns.

Indicator (a)(5)	Indicate, for each LEA in the State whose teachers receive performance ratings or levels through an evaluation system, whether the number and percentage (including numerator and denominator) of teachers rated at each performance rating or level are publicly reported for each school in the LEA.

Please respond (check Yes or No): Does the State collect, for each LEA in the State whose teachers receive performance ratings or levels through an evaluation system the number and percentage (including numerator and denominator) of teachers rated at each performance rating or level?

[1] ☐ Yes, the State collects these data.

If Yes, please respond (check one):

[2] ☐ The State makes the data *publicly available* and updates the data *at least annually* on a website.

➔ Provide the State website where the data are collected and publicly available:[3] Click here to enter text.

[4] ☐ The State makes the data *publicly available* on a website and updates the data *less than annually*.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the data publicly available and updating the data annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (a)(5)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

➔ Provide the State website where the most recently updated data are provided by the State to the public:[5] Click here to enter text.

[6] ☐ The State does not make the data publicly available on a website.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the data publicly available and updating the data annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (a)(5)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

[7] ☒ No, the State does not collect these data.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the data publicly available and updating the data annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (a)(5)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark both the Collection and Public Reporting columns.

Descriptor (a)(2)	Describe, for each LEA in the State, the systems used to evaluate the performance of principals and the use of results from those systems in decisions regarding principal development, compensation, promotion, retention, and removal.

Please respond (check Yes or No): Does the State collect a description of the system each LEA uses to evaluate the performance of principals?

[1] ☐ Yes, the State collects this information.

If Yes, please respond (check one):

[2] ☐ The State makes the information *publicly available* and updates it *at least annually* on a website.

➔ Provide the State website where the information is collected and publicly available:[3] Click here to enter text.

[4] ☐ The State makes the information *publicly available* on a website and updates the information *less than annually*.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Descriptor (a)(2)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

Provide the State website where the most recently updated information is provided by the State to the public:
[5] Click here to enter text.

[6] ☐ The State does not make the information publicly available on a website.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Descriptor (a)(2)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

[7] ☒ No, the State does not collect this information.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Descriptor (a)(2)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark both the Collection and Public Reporting columns.

Please respond (check Yes or No): Does the State collect a description of the manner in which each LEA uses the results of the evaluation systems described above related to the performance of principals in decisions regarding principal development, compensation, promotion, retention, and removal?

[8] ☐ Yes, the State collects this information.

If Yes, please respond (check one):

[9] ☐ The State makes the information *publicly available* and updates the information *at least annually* on a website.

➔ Provide the State website where the information is collected and publicly available:[10] Click here to enter text.

[11] ☐ The State makes the information *publicly available* on a website and updates the information *less than annually*.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Descriptor (a)(2)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

➔ Provide the State website where the most recently updated information are provided by the State to the public: [12] Click here to enter text.

[13] ☐ The State does not make the information publicly available on a website.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Descriptor (a)(2)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

[14] ☒ No, the State does not collect this information.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Descriptor (a)(2)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark both the Collection and Public Reporting columns.

Indicator (a)(6)	Indicate, for each LEA in the State, whether the systems used to evaluate the performance of principals include student achievement outcomes or student growth data as an evaluation criterion.

Please respond (check one): Does the State collect information on whether the system each LEA uses to evaluate the performance of principals includes student achievement outcomes or student growth data as an evaluation criterion?

1 ☐ Yes, the State collects this information.

If Yes, please respond (check one):

2 ☐ The State makes the information *publicly available* and updates it *at least annually* on a website.

➔ Provide the State website where the information is collected and publicly available:[3] Click here to enter text.

4 ☐ The State makes the information *publicly available* on a website and updates it *less than annually*.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (a)(6)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

➔ Provide the State website where the most recently updated information is provided by the State to the public:
[5] Click here to enter text.

6 ☐ The State does not make the information publicly available on a website.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (a)(6)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

7 ☒ No, the State does not collect this information.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (a)(6)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark both the Collection and Public Reporting columns.

Indicator (a)(7)	Provide, for each LEA in the State whose principals receive performance ratings or levels through an evaluation system, the number and percentage (including numerator and denominator) of principals rated at each performance rating or level.

Please respond (check one): Does the State collect and publicly report, for each LEA in the State whose principals receive performance ratings or levels through an evaluation system, the number and percentage of principals rated at each performance rating or level?

[1] ☐ Yes, the State collects these data.

If Yes, please respond (check one):

[2] ☐ The State makes the data *publicly available* and updates the data *at least annually* on a website.

➔ Provide the State website where the data are collected and publicly available:[3] Click here to enter text.

[4] ☐ The State makes the data *publicly available* on a website and updates the data *less than annually*.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the data publicly available and updating the data annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (a)(7)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

➔ Provide the State website where the most recently updated data are provided by the State to the public: [5] Click here to enter text.

[6] ☐ The State does not make the data publicly available on a website.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the data publicly available and updating the data annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (a)(7)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

[7] ☒ No, the State does not collect these data.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the data publicly available and updating the data annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (a)(7)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark both the Collection and Public Reporting columns.

II. Assurance (b): Improving Collection and Use of Data

A State must collect and publicly report information on the elements of its statewide longitudinal data system, on whether teachers receive data on student growth in a manner that is timely and informs instructional programs, and on whether the State provides teachers with reports of individual teacher impact on student achievement.

Indicator (b)(1)	Indicate which of the 12 elements described in section 6401(e)(2)(D) of the America COMPETES Act are included in the State's statewide longitudinal data system.

Instructions: Please indicate which of the 12 elements of the America COMPETES Act are included in the State's statewide longitudinal data system.

Please respond (check Yes or No): For pre-K through postsecondary education, does the State's statewide longitudinal data system include the following elements:

(1) A unique statewide student identifier that does not permit a student to be individually identified by users of the system?

☒ Yes.

☐ No. Provide a plan for including this element in your statewide longitudinal data system in Part 3B. Cite #1 in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section II.

(2) Student-level enrollment, demographic, and program participation information?

☒ Yes.

☐ No. Provide a plan for including this element in your statewide longitudinal data system in Part 3B. Cite #2 in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section II.

(3) Student-level information about the points at which students exit, transfer in, transfer out, drop out, or complete pre-K through postsecondary education programs?

☒ Yes.

☐ No. Provide a plan for including this element in your statewide longitudinal data system in Part 3B. Cite #3 in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section II.

(4) The capacity to communicate with higher education data systems?

- ☒ Yes.
- ☐ No. Provide a plan for including this element in your statewide longitudinal data system in Part 3B. Cite #4 in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section II.

(5) An audit system assessing data quality, validity, and reliability?

- ☒ Yes.
- ☐ No. Provide a plan for including this element in your statewide longitudinal data system in Part 3B. Cite #5 in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section II.

Please respond (check Yes or No): For pre-K through grade 12 education, does the State's statewide longitudinal data system include the following elements:

(6) Yearly State assessment records of individual students?

- ☒ Yes.
- ☐ No. Provide a plan for including this element in your statewide longitudinal data system in Part 3B. Cite #6 in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section II.

(7) Information on students not tested, by grade and subject?

- ☒ Yes.
- ☐ No. Provide a plan for including this element in your statewide longitudinal data system in Part 3B. Cite #7 in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section II.

(8) A teacher identifier system with the ability to match teachers to students?

- ☐ Yes.
- ☒ No. Provide a plan for including this element in your statewide longitudinal data system in Part 3B. Cite #8 in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section II.

(9) Student-level transcript information, including on courses completed and grades earned?

☒ Yes.

☐ No. Provide a plan for including this element in your statewide longitudinal data system in Part 3B. Cite #9 in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section II.

(10) Student-level college readiness test scores?

☒ Yes.

☐ No. Provide a plan for including this element in your statewide longitudinal data system in Part 3B. Cite #10 in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section II.

Please respond (check Yes or No): For postsecondary education, does the State's statewide longitudinal data system include the following elements:

(11) Information regarding the extent to which students transition successfully from secondary school to postsecondary education**,** including whether students enroll in remedial coursework?

☒ Yes.

☐ No. Provide a plan for including this element in your statewide longitudinal data system in Part 3B. Cite #11 in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section II.

(12) Other information determined necessary to address alignment and adequate preparation for success in postsecondary education?

☐ Yes.

☒ No. Provide a plan for including this element in your statewide longitudinal data system in Part 3B. Cite #12 in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section II.

Indicator (b)(2)	Indicate whether the State provides student growth data on their current students and the students they taught in the previous year to, at a minimum, teachers of reading/language arts and mathematics in grades in which the State administers assessments in those subjects in a manner that is timely and informs instructional programs.

Please respond (check Yes or No): Does the State provide student growth data on their current students and the students they taught the previous year to, at a minimum, teachers of reading/language arts and mathematics in grades in which the State administers assessments in those subjects, in a manner that is timely and informs instructional programs?

☐ Yes. You are not required to provide further information. In Part 3B, Section III, check "Not Applicable."

☒ No. Provide a plan for providing this information to teachers in Part 3B, Section III.

Indicator (b)(3)	Indicate whether the State provides teachers of reading/language arts and mathematics in grades in which the State administers assessments in those subjects with reports of individual teacher impact on student achievement on those assessments.

Please respond (check Yes or No): Does the State provide teachers of reading/language arts and mathematics in grades in which the State administers assessments in those subjects with reports of individual teacher impact on student achievement on those assessments?

☐ Yes. You are not required to provide further information. In Part 3B, Section IV, check "Not Applicable."

☒ No. Provide a plan for providing this information to teachers in Part 3B, Section IV.

III. Assurance (c): Standards and Assessments

A State must collect and publicly report data and other information on whether students are provided high-quality State assessments; whether students with disabilities and limited English proficient students are included in State assessment systems; whether the State makes information available regarding student academic performance in the State compared to the academic performance of students in other States; and on the extent to which students graduate from high school in four years with a regular high school diploma and continue on to pursue a college education.

Indicator (c)(1)	**Confirm the approval status, as determined by the Department, of the State's assessment system under section 1111(b)(3) of the ESEA with respect to reading/language arts, mathematics, and science assessments.**

Please respond (check one): Is the status of the Department's approval, available at http://www.ed.gov/programs/statestabilization/indicator-c1.xls correct?

[1] ☒ Yes, the status is correct.

[2] ☐ No, the status is not correct. If checked, provide below or in an attachment the correct information and any other supporting information. A URL linking to the correct data on the State's website is also sufficient: [3] Click here to enter text.

Please respond (check one):

[4] ☒ The State makes the status information *publicly available* and keeps it *up-to-date* on a website.

➔ Provide the State website where the status is provided by the State to the public:[5] www.michigan.gov/oeaa
Click on "Michigan Assessment & Accountability System Status"

Takes you to: HYPERLINK "/exchweb/bin/redir.asp?URL=http://www.michigan.gov/mde/0,1607,7-140-22709_31168-227558--,00.html"

http://www.michigan.gov/mde/0,1607,7-140-22709_31168-227558--,00.html [brings you to both letters]

Click on ELA and mathematics letter: Brings you to pdf: HYPERLINK "/exchweb/bin/redir.asp?URL=http://www.michigan.gov/documents/mde/Michigan_ELA__Mathematics_Letter_303680_7.pdf"

http://www.michigan.gov/documents/mde/Michigan_ELA__Mathematics_Letter_303680_7.pdf [ELA and mathematics letter]

Click on science assessment letter: Brings you to pdf: HYPERLINK

"/exchweb/bin/redir.asp?URL=http://www2.ed.gov/admins/lead/account/nclbfinalassess/miscience.html"

http://www2.ed.gov/admins/lead/account/nclbfinalassess/miscience.html [science assessments letter]

Note: Michigan anticipates receiving a letter indicating the status of it's science assessments in March 2010.

[6] ☐ The State makes the status information *publicly available* on a website but *does not keep it up-to-date*.

- ➔ If checked, provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (c)(1)" in the Plan Element Verification chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.
- ➔ Provide the State website where the most recently updated information is provided by the State to the public: [7] Click here to enter text.

[8] ☐ The State does not make the status information publicly available on a website.

- ➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (c)(1)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

\

Indicator (c)(2)	Confirm whether the State has developed and implemented valid and reliable alternate assessments for students with disabilities that are approved by the Department.

Please respond (Yes or No): Is the information related to this indicator, available at http://www.ed.gov/programs/statestabilization/indicator-c1.xls, correct?

[1] ☒ Yes, the status is correct.

[2] ☐ No, the status is not correct. If checked, provide below or in an attachment the correct information and any other supporting information. A URL linking to the correct data on the State's website is also sufficient:[3] Click here to enter text.

Please respond (check one):

[4] ☒ The State makes the status information *publicly available* and keeps it *up-to-date* on a website.

➔ Provide the State website where the status is provided by the State to the public:[5] www.michigan.gov/oeaa
HYPERLINK "/exchweb/bin/redir.asp?URL=http://www.michigan.gov/oeaa"www.michigan.gov/oeaa

Click on "Michigan Assessment & Accountability System Status"

Takes you to: HYPERLINK

"/exchweb/bin/redir.asp?URL=http://www.michigan.gov/mde/0,1607,7-140-22709_31168-227558--,00.html"

http://www.michigan.gov/mde/0,1607,7-140-22709_31168-227558--,00.html [brings you to both letters]

Click on ELA and mathematics letter: Brings you to pdf: HYPERLINK
"/exchweb/bin/redir.asp?URL=http://www.michigan.gov/documents/mde/Michigan_ELA__Mathematics_Letter_303680_7.pdf"

http://www.michigan.gov/documents/mde/Michigan_ELA__Mathematics_Letter_303680_7.pdf [ELA and mathematics letter]

Click on science assessment letter: Brings you to pdf: HYPERLINK
"/exchweb/bin/redir.asp?URL=http://www2.ed.gov/admins/lead/account/nclbfinalassess/miscience.html"

http://www2.ed.gov/admins/lead/account/nclbfinalassess/miscience.html [science assessments letter]

Note: Michigan anticipates receiving a letter indicating the status of it's science assessments in March 2010.

[6] ☐ The State makes the status information *publicly available* on a website and *does not keep it up-to-date*.

- ➔ Provide the State's plan for making the status publicly available and up-to-date on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (c)(2)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.
- ➔ Provide the State website where the information is collected and publicly available:[7] Click here to enter text.

[8] ☐ The State does not make the status information publicly available on a website.

- ➔ Provide the State's plan for making the status publicly available and up-to-date on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (c)(2)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

Indicator (c)(3)	Confirm whether the State's alternate assessments for students with disabilities, if approved by the Department, are based on grade-level, modified, or alternate academic achievement standards.

Please respond (check one): Is the information related to this indicator, available at http://www.ed.gov/programs/statestabilization/indicator-c1.xls, correct?

[1] ☒ Yes, the information is correct.

[2] ☐ No, the information is not correct.

➔ If checked, provide below or in an attachment the correct information and any other supporting information. A URL linking to the correct data on the State's website is also sufficient:[3] Click here to enter text.

Please respond (check one):

[4] ☒ The State makes the information *publicly available* and keeps it *up-to-date* on a website.
➔Provide the State website where the information is collected and publicly available:[5] www.michigan.gov/meap-access Click on "Eligibility Criteria and Guidelines for Participation". See pages 2-6 of the pdf.

[6] ☐ The State makes the information *publicly available* on a website but *does not keep it up-to-date*.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and up-to-date on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (c)(3)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

➔ Provide the State website where the information is collected and publicly available:[7] Click here to enter text.

[8] ☐ The State does not make the information publicly available on a website.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and up-to-date on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (c)(3)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

Indicator (c)(4)	Indicate whether the State has completed, within the last two years, an analysis of the appropriateness and effectiveness of the accommodations it provides students with disabilities to ensure their meaningful participation in State assessments.

Please respond (check one): Has the State, within the last two years, completed an analysis of the appropriateness and effectiveness of the accommodations it provides students with disabilities to ensure their meaningful participation in State assessments?

[1] ☐ Yes, this has been completed within the last two years.

[2] ☒ No, this has been completed, but it occurred more than two years ago.

[3] ☐ No, this has never been completed.

Please respond (check one):

[4] ☐ The State makes the information *publicly available* and keeps it *up-to-date* on a website.

- ➔ Provide the State website where the information is collected and publicly available:[5] Click here to enter text.

[6] ☐ The State makes the information *publicly available* on a website but *does not keep it up-to-date*.

- ➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and up-to-date on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (c)(4)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.
- ➔ Provide the State website where the information is collected and publicly available:[7]

[8] ☒ The State does not make the information publicly available on a website.

- ➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and up-to-date on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (c)(4)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

  Studies were carried out more than two years ago to evaluate the appropriateness and effectiveness of accommodations provided for students with disabilities (SDW) and English language learners (ELL). Those analyses were not carried out because of an omission by Michigan's contractors for the last two (or three) years, depending on the program. Michigan will assure that in the 2009-10 school year technical reports, the studies will be carried out and reported.

  For the information of the reviewers, in Michigan's approved peer review submission, the following response was given about how Michigan has determined whether accommodated versions of the assessments give a meaningful score for students with disabilities and English language learners.

"In order to definitively determine whether there are differences in the meaning of the scores obtained from regular and accommodated versions of the assessment, a direct measure of those differences would be needed. Such a study is not possible because in order to directly measure the difference in meaning, a child would have to be assigned randomly to either need or not need an accommodation. Randomly assigning children to utilize or not utilize the accommodation does not work because the study is then simply determining whether there are differences in scores that arise from having or not having accommodations rather than whether one has a more accurate meaning than the other. For students needing accommodations, the accommodated version should be assumed to have a more accurate meaning—there is no reason to assume otherwise. Likewise, for students not needing accommodations, the non-accommodated version should be assumed to have a more accurate meaning.

The problem for directly measuring differences in meaning is that there is no control group to compare the students needing accommodations to, since their disabilities cannot be eliminated, and there is no control group to compare the students not needing accommodations since disabilities cannot be added to these students for the purposes of studying changes in the meaning of scores.

For this reason, Michigan has chosen to use an indirect method of measuring whether the meaning changes by investigating changes in meaning of information gleaned from individual item responses from accommodated to non-accommodated versions of the assessment. Using Differential Item Functioning (DIF) analyses, one must assume that the overall score has more or less equal meaning across groups to identify whether there are any items that have different meanings across groups. However, at this point, when there is no valid comparison group for either accommodated or non-accommodated groups, DIF analysis is the best available proxy for understanding whether accommodated versions produce results of different meaning than non-accommodated versions."

In addition to these indirect analyses, Michigan has determined that it is appropriate to provide translated versions of Mathematics, Science, and Social Studies assessments for English language learners in Spanish and Arabic, in accordance with guidance to provide native-language versions where practicable. The definition of practicable adopted by the State is for any native-language population represention 10% or more of the ELL population in the State.

Finally, the development processes of individual items includes many safeguards for the development of items that are appropriate and meaningful for SWDs and ELLs. This is accomplished through assuring that these items go through rigorous review processes that specifically target issues of potential bias or sensitivity for SWDs and ELLs.

Indicator (c)(5)	Confirm the number and percentage (including numerator and denominator) of students with disabilities who are included in State reading/language arts and mathematics assessments.

Please respond (check one): Can the State confirm that the number and percentage of students with disabilities who are included in State *reading/language arts* assessments, available at http://www.ed.gov/programs/statestabilization/indicator-c5r.xls , are correct?

[1] ☐ Yes, the data are correct.

[2] ☒ No, the data are not correct.

➔ If checked, provide below or in an attachment the correct data and any supporting information. A URL linking to the correct data on the State's website is also sufficient:

- Michigan has identified the errors to this data in the 2007–08 CSPR submission. The State has contacted the appropriate entities at the federal level on 12/8/09 to determine the appropriate course of action to remediate these issues. Michigan has provided the correct information below.
  - Corrected Data for Michigan's 2007–08 CSPR—Students With Disabilities Participating in State Reading/Language Arts Assessment
    - Number of students with disabilities enrolled = 116,690
    - Number of students with disabilities participating = 113,812
    - Percentage of students with disabilities participating = 97.55%

Please respond (check one):

[4] ☒ The State makes the data relative to the inclusion of students with disabilities on State assessments in *reading/language arts publicly available* and keeps it *up-to-date* on a website.

➔ Provide the State website where the data are collected and publicly available:[5]
http://www.michigan.gov/mde/0,1607,7-140-6530_6598_31834---,00.html
Click on "FFY 2008 Part B Annual Performance Report (2/1/10)". See pp. 24- 36 of the pdf.

[6] ☐ The State makes the data relative to the inclusion of students with disabilities on State assessments in *reading/language arts publicly available* on a website but *does not keep it up-to-date*.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the data publicly available and up-to-date on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (c)(5)" in the

Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

➔ Provide the State website where the data are collected and publicly available:[7] Click here to enter text.

8 ☐ The State does not make the data relative to the inclusion of students with disabilities on State assessments in *reading/language arts publicly available* on a website.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the data publicly available and up-to-date on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (c)(5)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

Please respond (check one): Can the State confirm that the number and percentage of students with disabilities who are included in State *mathematics* assessments, available at http://www.ed.gov/programs/statestabilization/indicator-c5m.xls , are correct?

9 ☐ Yes, the data are correct.

10 ☒ No, the data are not correct.

➔ If checked, provide below or in an attachment the correct data and any supporting information. A URL linking to the correct data on the State's website is also sufficient:

- Michigan has identified the errors to this data in the 2007–2008 CSPR submission. The State has contacted the appropriate entities at the federal level on 12/8/09 to determine the appropriate course of action to remediate these issues. Michigan has provided the correct information below.
    - Corrected Data for Michigan's 2007–2008 CSPR—Students With Disabilities Participating in State Mathematics Assessment
        - Number of students with disabilities enrolled = 116,670
        - Number of students with disabilities participating = 114,532
        - Percentage of students with disabilities participating = 98.17%

Please respond (check one):

12 ☒ The State makes the data relative to the inclusion of students with disabilities on State assessments in *mathematics publicly available* and keeps it *up-to-date* on a website.

➔ Provide the State website where the data are collected and publicly available:[13]
http://www.michigan.gov/mde/0,1607,7-140-6530_6598_31834---,00.html
Click on "FFY 2008 Part B Annual Performance Report (2/1/10)". See pp. 24- 36 of the pdf.

[14] ☐ The State makes the data relative to the inclusion of students with disabilities on State assessments in *mathematics publicly available* on a website but *does not keep it up-to-date*.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the data publicly available and up-to-date on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (c)(5)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

➔ Provide the State website where the data are collected and publicly available:[15] Click here to enter text.

[16] ☐ The State does not make the data relative to the inclusion of students with disabilities on State assessments in *mathematics* publicly available on a website.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the data publicly available and up-to-date on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (c)(5)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

Indicator (c)(6)	Indicate whether the State has completed, within the last two years, an analysis of the appropriateness and effectiveness of the accommodations it provides limited English proficient students to ensure their meaningful participation in State assessments.

Please respond (check one): Has the State completed, within the last two years, an analysis of the appropriateness and effectiveness of the accommodations it provides limited English proficient students to ensure their meaningful participation in State assessments?

[1] ☐ Yes, this was completed within the last two years.

[2] ☒ No, this was completed more than two years ago.

[3] ☐ No, this has never been completed.

Please respond (check one):

[4] ☐ The State makes the information *publicly available* and keeps it *up-to-date* on a website.

➔ Provide the State website where the information is collected and publicly available:[5] Click here to enter text.

[6] ☐ The State makes the information *publicly available* on a website but *does not keep it up-to-date*.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and up-to-date on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (c)(6)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

➔ Provide the State website where the information is collected and publicly available:[7]

[8] ☒ The State does not make the information publicly available on a website.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and up-to-date on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (c)(6)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

Studies were carried out more than two years ago to evaluate the appropriateness and effectiveness of accommodations provided for students with disabilities (SDW) and English language learners (ELL). Those analyses were not carried out because of an omission by Michigan's contractors for the last two (or three) years, depending on the program. Michigan will assure that in the 2009-10 school year technical reports, the studies will be carried out and reported.

For the information of the reviewers, in Michigan's approved peer review submission, the following response was given about how Michigan has determined whether accommodated versions of the assessments give a meaningful score for students with disabilities and English language learners.

"In order to definitively determine whether there are differences in the meaning of the scores obtained from regular and accommodated versions of the assessment, a direct measure of those differences would be needed. Such a study is not possible because in order to directly measure the difference in meaning, a child would have to be assigned randomly to either need or not need an accommodation. Randomly assigning children to utilize or not utilize the accommodation does not work because the study is then simply determining whether there are differences in scores that arise from having or not having accommodations rather than whether one has a more accurate meaning than the other. For students needing accommodations, the accommodated version should be assumed to have a more accurate meaning—there is no reason to assume otherwise. Likewise, for students not needing accommodations, the non-accommodated version should be assumed to have a more accurate meaning.

The problem for directly measuring differences in meaning is that there is no control group to compare the students needing accommodations to, since their disabilities cannot be eliminated, and there is no control group to compare the students not needing accommodations since disabilities cannot be added to these students for the purposes of studying changes in the meaning of scores.

For this reason, Michigan has chosen to use an indirect method of measuring whether the meaning changes by investigating changes in meaning of information gleaned from individual item responses from accommodated to non-accommodated versions of the assessment. Using Differential Item Functioning (DIF) analyses, one must assume that the overall score has more or less equal meaning across groups to identify whether there are any items that have different meanings across groups. However, at this point, when there is no valid comparison group for either accommodated or non-accommodated groups, DIF analysis is the best available proxy for understanding whether accommodated versions produce results of different meaning than non-accommodated versions."

In addition to these indirect analyses, Michigan has determined that it is appropriate to provide translated versions of Mathematics, Science, and Social Studies assessments for English language learners in Spanish and Arabic, in accordance with guidance to provide native-language versions where practicable. The definition of practicable adopted by the State is for any native-language population represention 10% or more of the ELL population in the State.

Finally, the development processes of individual items includes many safeguards for the development of items that are appropriate and meaningful for SWDs and ELLs. This is accomplished through assuring that these items go through rigorous review processes that specifically target issues of potential bias or sensitivity for SWDs and ELLs.

Indicator (c)(7)	Confirm whether the State provides native language versions of State assessments for limited English proficient students that are approved by the Department.

Please respond (check one): Is the information related to this indicator, available at http://www.ed.gov/programs/statestabilization/indicator-c1.xls, correct?

[1] ☒ Yes, the information is correct.

[2] ☐ No, the information is not correct.

➔ If checked, provide below or in an attachment the correct information and any supporting information. A URL linking to the correct data on the State's website is also sufficient:
[3] Click here to enter text.

Please respond (check one): Is the State's current status available on the State's website?

[4] ☐ The State makes the information *publicly available* and keeps it *up-to-date* on a website.

➔ Provide the State website where the information is collected and publicly available:[5] Click here to enter text.

[6] ☒ The State makes the information *publicly available* on a website but *does not keep it up-to-date*.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and up-to-date on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (c)(7)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

➔ Provide the State website where the information is collected and publicly available:[7] This information can be found in the for Michigan's assessment programs at the following web pages: www.michigan.gov/meap. To access the MEAP information, click on 'Administration Manuals - Fall 2009'. Each manual contains this information. For example, click on the 'Grade 5 Administration Manual' and see p. 3 of the pdf that opens.

www.michigan.gov/mme To access the MME information, click on 'MME Testing with Accommodations'. Then click 'Spring 2010 MME Accommodations Summary Table' and see p. 10, 12, 13, and 17 of the pdf that opens.

[8] ☐ The State does not make the information publicly available on a website.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and up-to-date on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (c)(7)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

Indicator (c)(8)	**Confirm the number and percentage (including numerator and denominator) of limited English proficient students who are included in State reading/language arts and mathematics assessments.**	Confirm

Please respond (check one): Can the State confirm that the number and percentage of limited English proficient students who are included in State *reading/language arts* assessments, available at http://www.ed.gov/programs/statestabilization/indicator-c8r.xls , are correct?

[1] ☐ Yes, the data are correct.

[2] ☒ No, the data are not correct.

➔ If checked, provide below or in an attachment the correct data and any supporting information. A URL linking to the correct data on the State's website is also sufficient:

- Michigan has identified the errors to this data in the 2007–08 CSPR submission. The State has contacted the appropriate entities at the federal level on 12/8/09 to determine the appropriate course of action to remediate these issues. Michigan has provided the correct information below.
  - Corrected Data for Michigan's 2007–08 CSPR—Limited English Proficient Students Participating in State Reading/Language Arts Assessment
    - Number of limited-English-proficient students enrolled = 27,563
    - Number of limited-English-proficient students participating = 25,983
    - Percentage of limited-English-proficient students participating = 94.27%

Please respond (check one):

[4] ☐ The State makes the data relative to the inclusion of limited English proficient students on State assessments in *reading/language arts publicly available* and keeps it *up-to-date* on a website.

➔ Provide the State website where the data are collected and publicly available:[5] Click here to enter text.

[6] ☐ The State makes the data relative to the inclusion of limited English proficient students on State assessments in *reading/language arts publicly available* on a website but *does not keep it up-to-date*.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the data publicly available and up-to-date on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (c)(8)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

➔ Provide the State website where the data are collected and publicly available:[7] Click here to enter text.

[8] ☒ The State does not make the data relative to the inclusion of limited English proficient students on State assessments in *reading/language arts publicly available* on a website.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the data publicly available and up-to-date on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (c)(8)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

Please respond (check one): Can the State confirm that the number and percentage of limited English proficient students who are included in State *mathematics* assessments, available at http://www.ed.gov/programs/statestabilization/indicator-c8m.xls , are correct?

[9] ☐ Yes, the data are correct.

[10] ☒ No, the data are not correct.

➔ If checked, provide below or in an attachment the correct data and any supporting information. A URL linking to the correct data on the State's website is also sufficient:

- Michigan has identified the errors to this data in the 2007–08 CSPR submission. The State has contacted the appropriate entities at the federal level on 12/8/09 to determine the appropriate course of action to remediate these issues. Michigan has provided the correct information below.
  - Corrected Data for Michigan's 2007–08 CSPR—Limited English Proficient Students Participating in State Mathematics Assessment
  - Number of limited-English-proficient students enrolled = 27,563
  - Number of limited-English-proficient students participating = 25,983
  - Percentage of limited-English-proficient students participating = 94.27%

Please respond (check one):

[12] ☐ The State makes the data relative to the inclusion of limited English proficient students on State assessments in *mathematics publicly available* and keeps it *up-to-date* on a website.

➔ Provide the State website where the data are collected and publicly available:[13] Click here to enter text.

[14] ☐ The State makes the data relative to the inclusion of limited English proficient students on State assessments in *mathematics publicly available* on a website but *does not keep it up-to-date*.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the data publicly available and up-to-date on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (c)(8)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

- ➔ Provide the State website where the data are collected and publicly available:[15] Click here to enter text.

[16]☒ The State does not make the data relative to the inclusion of limited English proficient students on State assessments in *mathematics* publicly available on a website.

- ➔ Provide the State's plan for making the data publicly available and up-to-date on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (c)(8)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

Indicator (c)(9)	Confirm that the State's annual State Report Card (under section 1111(h)(1) of the ESEA) contains the most recent available State reading and mathematics National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) results as required by 34 CFR 200.11(c).	Confirm

Please respond (check one): Does the State Report Card include the most recent available State reading and math National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) results?

☒ Yes, the State Report Card includes this information.

☐ No, the State Report Card does not include this information.

➔ If checked, please provide a plan for including this information on the State Report Card in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (c)(9)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I, and mark the Public Reporting column.

Please supply the following information:

Please attach the State Report Card or provide the URL where the State Report Card is provided to the public:
http://www.michigan.gov/mde/0,1607,7-140-22709_25058---,00.html

Indicator (c)(10)	Provide, for the State, for each LEA in the State, for each high school in the State and, at each of these levels, by student subgroup (consistent with section 1111(b)(2)(C)(v)(II) of the ESEA), the number and percentage (including numerator and denominator) of students who graduate from high school using a four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate as required by 34 CFR 200.19(b)(1)(i).

Please respond (check one): Does the State collect these data (as defined in Indicator (c)(10))?

1 ☒ Yes, the State collects these data.

If Yes, please respond (check one):

2 ☒ The State makes the data *publicly available* and updates the data *at least annually* on a website.

→Provide the State website where the data are collected and publicly available:[3]

http://www.michigan.gov/cepi/0,1607,7-113-21423_30451_51357---,00.html

From the CEPI Web site (www.michigan.gov/cepi):

1. From the left side navigation, select "data and reports"
2. From the left side navigation, select "students"
3. From the center of the page, select the box entitled "Michigan Cohort Graduation and Dropout Reports"
4. In the center of the page, there is a box called "Reports". The first two reports listed are needed for this indicator. The first is displayed in PDF format and is called "**2008 Cohort 4-Year and 2007 Cohort 5-Year Graduation and Dropout Rates**"; and the second report is actually contained in a downloadable ZIP file entitled "**2008 Cohort 4-Year and 2007 Cohort 5-Year Graduation and Dropout Rates including subgroup.**" The tabs in the second report will show subgroup data.

4 ☐ The State makes the data *publicly available* on a website and updates the data *less than annually*.

- → Provide the State's plan for making the data publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (c)(10)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.
- → Provide the State website where the data are collected and publicly available:[5] Click here to enter text.

6 ☐ The State does not make the data publicly available on a website.

- → Provide the State's plan for making the data publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (c)(10)” in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

[7] ☐ No, the State does not collect these data.

➔ Provide the State’s plan for making the data publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite “Indicator (c)(10)” in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Collection and Public Reporting column.

Indicator (c)(11)	Provide, for the State, for each LEA in the State, for each high school in the State and, at each of these levels, by student subgroup (consistent with section 1111(b)(2)(C)(v)(II) of the ESEA), of the students who graduate from high school consistent with 34 CFR 200.19(b)(1)(i), the number and percentage (including numerator and denominator) who enroll in an institution of higher education (IHE) (as defined in section 101(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended (HEA)) within 16 months of receiving a regular high school diploma.

Please respond (check one): Does the State collect these data (as defined in Indicator (c)(11))?

1 ☐ Yes, the State collects these data.

If Yes, please respond (check one):

2 ☐ The State makes the data *publicly available* and updates the data *at least annually* on a website.

➔ Provide the State website where the data are collected and publicly available:3 Click here to enter text.

4 ☐ The State makes the data *publicly available* on a website and updates the data *less than annually*.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the data publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Mark the Public Reporting column next to "Indicator (c)(11)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I.

➔ Provide the State website where the data are collected and publicly available:5 Click here to enter text.

6 ☐ The State does not make the data publicly available on a website.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the data publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Mark the Public Reporting column next to "Indicator (c)(11)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I.

7 ☒ No, the State does not collect these data.

If No, please respond (check one):

☒ The State will develop and implement the means to collect and publicly report the data (i.e., the State will collect and publicly report the data) by September 30, 2011.

➔ Provide the State's plan for collecting, making the data publicly available, and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B, Section I. Mark both the Collection and Public Reporting columns next to "Indicator (c)(11)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I.

☐ The State will <u>develop but not implement</u> the means to collect and publicly report the data (i.e., the State <u>will not</u> collect and publicly report the data) by September 30, 2011.

- ➔ Provide the State's plan for developing the means to collect and to publicly report the data (but not the State's implementation of those means) in Part 3B, Section V.

Indicator (c)(12)	Provide, for the State, for each LEA in the State, for each high school in the State and, at each of these levels, by student subgroup (consistent with section 1111(b)(2)(C)(v)(II) of the ESEA), of the students who graduate from high school consistent with 34 CFR 200.19(b)(1)(i) who enroll in a public IHE (as defined in section 101(a) of the HEA) in the State within 16 months of receiving a regular high school diploma, the number and percentage (including numerator and denominator) who complete at least one year's worth of college credit (applicable to a degree) within two years of enrollment in the IHE.

Please respond (check one): Does the State collect these data (as defined in Indicator (c)(12))?

1 ☐ Yes, the State collects these data.

If Yes, please respond (check one):

2 ☐ The State makes the data *publicly available* and updates the data *at least annually* on a website.

➔ Provide the State website where the data are collected and publicly available:3 Click here to enter text.

4 ☐ The State makes the data *publicly available* on a website and updates the data *less than annually*.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the data publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Mark the Public Reporting column next to "Indicator (c)(12)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I.

➔ Provide the State website where the data are collected and publicly available:5 Click here to enter text.

6 ☐ The State does not make the data publicly available on a website.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the data publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Mark the Public Reporting column next to "Indicator (c)(12)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I.

7 ☒ No, the State does not collect these data.

If No, please respond (check one):

☒ The State will develop and implement the means to collect and publicly report the data (i.e., the State will collect and publicly report the data) by September 30, 2011.

➔ Provide the State's plan for collecting, making the data publicly available, and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B, Section I. Mark both the Collection and Public Reporting columns next to "Indicator (c)(12)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I.

☐ The State will develop but not implement the means to collect and publicly report the data (i.e., the State will not collect and publicly report the data) by September 30, 2011.

➔ Provide the State's plan for developing the means to collect and to publicly report the data (but not the State's implementation of those means) in Part 3B, Section V.

IV. Assurance (d): Supporting Struggling Schools

A State must collect and publicly report data and other information on the progress of certain groups of schools in the State on State assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics; on the extent to which reforms to improve student academic achievement are implemented in the persistently lowest-achieving schools in the State; and on the extent to which charter schools are operating in the State.

Indicator (d)(1)	Provide, for the State, the average statewide school gain in the "all students" category and the average statewide school gain for each student subgroup (as under section 1111(b)(2)(C)(v) of the ESEA) on the State assessments in reading/language arts and for the State and for each LEA in the State, the number and percentage (including numerator and denominator) of Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that have made progress (as defined in this notice) on State assessments in reading/language arts in the last year.

Please respond (check one): Does the State collect these data?

[1] ☒ Yes, the State collects these data.

If Yes, please respond (check one):

[2] ☐ The State makes the data *publicly available* and updates the data *at least annually* on a website.

➔ Provide the State website where the data are collected and publicly available:[3] Click here to enter text.

[4] ☐ The State makes the data *publicly available* on a website and updates the data *less than annually*.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the data publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (d)(1)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

Provide the State website where the most recently updated data are provided by the State to the public:
[5] Click here to enter text.

[6] ☒ The State does not make the data publicly available on a website.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the data publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (d)(1)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

[7] ☐ No, the State does not collect these data.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the data publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (d)(1)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark both the Collection and Public Reporting columns.

Indicator (d)(2)	Provide, for the State, the average statewide school gain in the "all students" category and the average statewide school gain for each student subgroup (as under section 1111(b)(2)(C)(v) of the ESEA) on State assessments in mathematics and for the State and for each LEA in the State, the number and percentage (including numerator and denominator) of Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that have made progress on State assessments in mathematics in the last year.

Please respond (check one): Does the State collect these data?

[1] ☒ Yes, the State collects these data.

If Yes, please respond (check one):

[2] ☐ The State makes the data *publicly available* and updates the data *at least annually* on a website.

➔ Provide the State website where the data are collected and publicly available:[3] Click here to enter text.

[4] ☐ The State makes the data *publicly available* on a website and updates the data *less than annually*.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the data publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (d)(2)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

➔ Provide the State website where the most recently updated data are provided by the State to the public: [5] Click here to enter text.

[6] ☒ The State does not make the data publicly available on a website.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the data publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (d)(2)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

[7] ☐ No, the State does not collect these data.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the data publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (d)(2)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark both the Collection and Public Reporting columns.

Descriptor (d)(1)	Provide the definition of "persistently lowest-achieving schools" (consistent with the requirements for defining this term set forth in the Definitions section of the NFR) that the State uses to identify such schools.

Please respond (check Yes or No): Does the State have a definition of "persistently lowest achieving schools" (consistent with the requirements for defining this term set forth in the Definitions section of the NFR) for the purposes of this indicator?

[1] ☒ Yes, the State has a definition of "persistently lowest achieving schools" for the purposes of this indicator.

The following business rules were used to create the list of lowest performing 5% of high schools:

- Schools were included in the high school list if they had any 11th grade students with MME or MI-Access reading or math test scores
- Students with a valid math and reading score in the MME and MI-Access assessments were included.
- A student with a performance level of 1 or 2 is considered proficient.
- The percent of students proficient in a school is determined by taking the total number of proficient students and dividing by the total number of students tested.
- Proficiency rates were based only on the most recent year.
- Improvement rates were calculated using a simple regression of proficiency rates over the most recent three years.
- Improvement rates were classified as statistically significant or not based on traditional regression methods.
- A proficiency plus improvement rate was calculated by adding together proficiency rates plus any positive, statistically significant improvement rate.
- The final list of the lowest performing 5% of high schools is broken down by the following
  - Up to 2.5% is determined by taking the schools with the lowest graduation rates for the last three years running at most 60% or lower.
  - The remainder of the 5% was filled out by starting at 0% proficiency + improvement, and raising that bar until enough schools are beneath the bar in both reading and mathematics to have 5% of schools show up on the list.

Exclusions: Nonpublic schools, shared entity schools whose student test scores are sent back to the resident school, and schools with fewer than 30 students tested

The following business rules were used to create the list of lowest performing 5% of elementary and middle schools:

- Only students in Grades 3–8 were included.
- Schools were included in the elementary/middle school list if they had any student in Grades 3–8 who had a MEAP or MI-Access reading or mathematics score.
- Students with a valid math and reading score in the MEAP and MI-Access assessments were included.
- A student with a performance level of 1 or 2 is considered proficient.
- The percentage of students proficient or improving in a school is determined by taking the total number of students who are proficient or who showed an *improvement* or *significant improvement* over the previous year and dividing by the total number of students tested.
- All student scores across all grades were combined to create proficient or improving rates
- Proficient or improving rates were based only on the most recent year.
- The final list of the lowest performing 5% of elementary and middles schools was identified by starting at a proficient or improving rate of 0% and raising the bar until 5% of the eligible schools were below the bar in both reading and mathematics.

Exclusions: nonpublic schools, shared entity schools whose student test scores are sent back to the resident school, and schools with fewer than 30 students tested.

The following step is applied to both the high school and elementary/middle school lists:

Once the lowest 5% of all schools are identified, Michigan designates as "high priority" those schools on that list that have failed to make adequate yearly progress (AYP) for two or more consecutive years. The high priority schools are those targeted for turnaround.

If Yes, please respond (check one):

[3] ☐ The State has made the definition *publicly available* on a website.

➔ Provide the State website where the definition is publicly available:[4] Click here to enter text.

[5] ☒ The State does not make the definition publicly available on a website.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the definition publicly available in Part 3B. Cite "Descriptor (d)(1)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

We will consult with the U.S. Department of Education in the coming weeks in the development of an approvable definition of persistently lowest-achieving schools as part of our application for funding under the School Improvement Grant program.

Within 15 days of being notified that the Department has approved our definition, we will make that definition publicly available at http://www.michigan.gov/mde/0,1607,7-140-6530_30334_51051-228482--,00.html .

6 ☐ No, the State does not have a definition of "persistently lowest achieving schools" for the purposes of this indicator.

➔ Provide the State's plan for developing a definition and making it publicly available on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Descriptor (d)(1)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark both the Collection and Public Reporting columns.

Indicator (d)(3)	Provide, for the State, the number and identity of the schools that are Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring, that are identified as persistently lowest-achieving schools.

Please respond (check one): Does the State collect this information?

[1] ☒ Yes, the State collects this information.

If Yes, please respond (check one):

[2] ☐ The State makes the information *publicly available* and updates the data *at least annually* on a website.

➔ Provide the State website where the information is collected and publicly available:[3] Click here to enter text.

[4] ☐ The State makes the data *publicly available* on a website and updates the information *less than annually*.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (d)(3)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

➔ Provide the State website where the most recently updated information is provided by the State to the public: [5] Click here to enter text.

[6] ☒ The State does not make the information publicly available on a website.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (d)(3)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

Within 15 days of being notified that the Department has approved our definition of persistently lowest-achieving schools, we will also update or provide, as applicable, our response to Indicator (d)(3).

[7] ☐ No, the State does not collect this information.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (d)(3)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark both the Collection and Public Reporting columns.

Indicator (d)(4)	Provide, for the State, of the persistently lowest-achieving schools that are Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring, the number and identity of those schools that have been turned around, restarted, closed, or transformed (as defined in the NFR) in the last year.

Please respond (check one): Does the State collect this information?

1 ☒ Yes, the State collects this information.

If Yes, please respond (check one):

2 ☐ The State makes the information *publicly available* and updates the data *at least annually* on a website.

➔ Provide the State website where the information is collected and publicly available:[3] Click here to enter text.

4 ☐ The State makes the data *publicly available* on a website and updates the information *less than annually*.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (d)(4)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

➔ Provide the State website where the most recently updated information is provided by the State to the public: [5] Click here to enter text.

6 ☒ The State does not make the information publicly available on a website.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (d)(4)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

Within 15 days of being notified that the Department has approved our definition of persistently lowest-achieving schools, we will also update or provide, as applicable, our response to Indicator (d)(4).

7 ☐ No, the State does not collect this information.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (d)(4)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark both the Collection and Public Reporting columns.

Indicator (d)(5)	**Provide, for the State, the number and identity of the schools that are secondary schools that are eligible do not receive, Title I funds, that are identified as persistently lowest-achieving schools.**

Please respond (check one): Does the State collect this information?

[1] ☒ Yes, the State collects this information.

If Yes, please respond (check one):

[2] ☐ The State makes the information *publicly available* and updates the data *at least annually* on a website.

➔ Provide the State website where the information is collected and publicly available:[3] Click here to enter text.

[4] ☐ The State makes the data *publicly available* on a website and updates the information *less than annually*.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (d)(5)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

➔ Provide the State website where the most recently updated information is provided by the State to the public: [5] Click here to enter text.

[6] ☒ The State does not make the information publicly available on a website.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (d)(5)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

Within 15 days of being notified that the Department has approved our definition of persistently lowest-achieving schools, we will also update or provide, as applicable, our response to Indicator (d)(5).

[7] ☐ No, the State does not collect this information.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (d)(5)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark both the Collection and Public Reporting columns.

Indicator (d)(6)	**Provide, for the State, of the persistently lowest-achieving schools that are secondary schools that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I funds, the number and identity of those schools that have been turned around, restarted, closed, or transformed in the last year.**

Please respond (check one): Does the State collect this information?

[1] ☒ Yes, the State collects this information.

If Yes, please respond (check one):

[2] ☐ The State makes the information *publicly available* and updates the data *at least annually* on a website.

➔ Provide the State website where the information is collected and publicly available:[3] Click here to enter text.

[4] ☐ The State makes the data *publicly available* on a website and updates the information *less than annually*.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (d)(6)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

Provide the State website where the most recently updated information is provided by the State to the public:
[5] Click here to enter text.

[6] ☒ The State does not make the information publicly available on a website.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (d)(6)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

Within 15 days of being notified that the Department has approved our definition of persistently lowest-achieving schools, we will also update or provide, as applicable, our response to Indicator (d)(6).

[7] ☐ No, the State does not collect this information.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (d)(6)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark both the Collection and Public Reporting columns.

Indicator (d)(7)	Provide, for the State and, if applicable, for each LEA in the State, the number of charter schools that are currently permitted to operate under State law.

Please respond (check one): Does the State collect this information?

1 ☒ Yes, the State collects this information.

If Yes, please respond (check one):

2 ☒ The State makes the information *publicly available* and updates the data *at least annually* on a website.

➔ Provide the State website where the information is collected and publicly available:[3]

There is no set number of charter schools allowed to operate in Michigan. Charter schools may be authorized by a public university, community college, K–12 local education agency, or an intermediate school district (regional education service agency). Newly passed legislation removed the cap previously imposed on the number of charter schools that public universities may authorize. There is no cap imposed on any other type of authorizer.

An up-to-date list of all charter schools is provided at this URL:
http://www.michigan.gov/mde/0,1607,7-140-6530_6559_6558-23300--,00.html

4 ☐ The State makes the data *publicly available* on a website and updates the information *less than annually*.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (d)(7)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

➔ Provide the State website where the most recently updated information is provided by the State to the public:
[5] Click here to enter text.

6 ☐ The State does not make the information publicly available on a website.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (d)(7)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

7 ☐ No, the State does not collect this information.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (d)(7)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark both the Collection and Public Reporting columns.

Indicator (d)(8)	Confirm, for the State and for each LEA in the State that operates charter schools, the number of charter schools currently operating.	Confirm

Please respond (check one): Is the number of charter schools publicly reported as currently operating for the State and for each LEA at http://www.ed.gov/programs/statestabilization/indicator-d8.xls correct?

[1] ☒ Yes, the data are correct.

[2] ☐ No, the data are not correct.

➔ If checked, provide below or in an attachment the correct data and any supporting information. A URL linking to the correct data on the State's website is also sufficient: [3] Click here to enter text.

Please respond (check one):

[4] ☒ The State makes the data *publicly available* and keeps it *up-to-date* on a website.

➔ Provide the State website where the data are collected and publicly available:[5]

An up-to-date list of all charter schools is provided at this URL:
http://www.michigan.gov/mde/0,1607,7-140-6530_6559_6558-23300--,00.html

[6] ☐ The State makes the data *publicly available* on a website but *does not keep it up-to-date*.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the data publicly available and up-to-date on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (d)(8)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

➔ Provide the State website where the most recently updated information is provided by the State to the public:
[7] Click here to enter text.

[8] ☐ The State does not make the data publicly available on a website.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the data publicly available and up-to-date on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (d)(8)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

Indicator (d)(9)	Provide, for the State and for each LEA in the State that operates charter schools, the number and percentage of charter schools that have made progress on State assessments in reading/language arts in the last year.

Please respond (check one): Does the State collect this information?

1 ☒ Yes, the State collects this information.

If Yes, please respond (check one):

2 ☐ The State makes the information *publicly available* and updates the information *at least annually* on a website.

➔ Provide the State website where the information is collected and publicly available:[3]

The SEA is required to submit an annual report on charter schools to the state Legislature. The report contains an analysis of each charter school's progress and other information. However, the definition of progress differs from the SFSF and RTTT definition. Individual reports on each charter school can be viewed at this URL: http://www.michigan.gov/documents/mde/CharterSchoolProfiles2007_221729_7.pdf

4 ☐ The State makes the information *publicly available* on a website and updates the information *less than annually*.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (d)(9)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

Provide the State website where the most recently updated information is provided by the State to the public:
5 Click here to enter text.

6 ☒ The State does not make the information publicly available on a website.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (d)(9)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

7 ☐ No, the State does not collect this information.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (d)(9)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark both the Collection and Public Reporting columns.

Indicator (d)(10)	Provide, for the State and for each LEA in the State that operates charter schools, the number and percentage of charter schools that have made progress on State assessments in mathematics in the last year.

Please respond (check one): Does the State collect this information?

1 ☒ Yes, the State collects this information.

If Yes, please respond (check one):

2 ☐ The State makes the information *publicly available* and updates the information *at least annually* on a website.

➔ Provide the State website where the information is collected and publicly available:[3]

The SEA is required to submit an annual report on charter schools to the state Legislature. The report contains an analysis of each charter school's progress and other information. However, the definition of progress differs from the SFSF and RTTT definition. Individual reports on each charter school can be viewed at this URL: http://www.michigan.gov/documents/mde/CharterSchoolProfiles2007_221729_7.pdf

4 ☐ The State makes the information *publicly available* on a website and updates the information *less than annually*.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (d)(10)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

➔ Provide the State website where the most recently updated information is provided by the State to the public: [5] Click here to enter text.

6 ☒ The State does not make the information publicly available on a website.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (d)(10)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

7 ☐ No, the State does not collect this information.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (d)(10)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark both the Collection and Public Reporting columns.

Indicator (d)(11)	Provide, for the State and for each LEA in the State that operates charter schools, the number and identity of charter schools that have closed (including schools that were not reauthorized to operate) within each of the last five years.

Please respond (check one): Does the State collect this information?

[1] ☒ Yes, the State collects this information.

If Yes, please respond (check one):

[2] ☒ The State makes the information *publicly available* and updates the information *at least annually* on a website.

➔ Provide the State website where the information is collected and publicly available:[3]

The state publishes a list of charter schools that have been closed and the date closed. The reason for closure is not included at this time. The URL for closed charter schools is here: http://www.michigan.gov/documents/Closed_55511_7.pdf

[4] ☐ The State makes the information *publicly available* on a website and updates the information *less than annually*.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (d)(11)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

➔ Provide the State website where the most recently updated information is provided by the State to the public:
[5] Click here to enter text.

[6] ☐ The State does not make the information publicly available on a website.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (d)(11)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

[7] ☐ No, the State does not collect this information.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (d)(11)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark both the Collection and Public Reporting columns.

Indicator (d)(12)	Indicate, for each charter school that has closed (including a school that was not reauthorized to operate) within each of the last five years, whether the closure of the school was for financial, enrollment, academic, or other reasons.

Please respond (check one): Does the State collect this information?

1 ☒ Yes, the State collects this information.

If Yes, please respond (check one):

2 ☐ The State makes the information *publicly available* and updates the information *at least annually* on a website.

➔ Provide the State website where the information is collected and publicly available:3 Click here to enter text.

4 ☐ The State makes the information *publicly available* on a website and updates the information *less than annually*.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (d)(12)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

Provide the State website where the most recently updated information is provided by the State to the public:
5 Click here to enter text.

6 ☒ The State does not make the information publicly available on a website.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (d)(12)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

7 ☐ No, the State does not collect this information.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (d)(12)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark both the Collection and Public Reporting columns.

PART 3B: DATA COLLECTION AND PUBLIC REPORTING PLAN

Plan Element Verification

Element	Collection (check if applies)	Public Reporting (check if applies)
Descriptor (a)(1)	X	X
Indicator (a)(3)	X	X
Indicator (a)(4)	X	X
Indicator (a)(5)	X	X
Descriptor (a)(2)	X	X
Indicator (a)(6)	X	X
Indicator (a)(7)	X	X
Indicator (c)(4)		X
Indicator (c)(6)		X
Indicator (c)(7)		X
Indicator (c)(8)		X
Indicator (c)(11)	X	X
Indicator (c)(12)	X	X
Indicator (d)(1)		X
Indicator (d)(2)		X
Descriptor (d)(1)		X
Indicator (d)(3)		X
Indicator (d)(4)		X
Indicator (d)(5)		X
Indicator (d)(6)		X
Indicator (d)(9)		X
Indicator (d)(10)		X
Indicator (d)(12)		X

Descriptor (a)(1): Describe, for each local educational agency (LEA) in the State, the systems used to evaluate the performance of teachers and the use of results from those systems in decisions regarding teacher development, compensation, promotion, retention, and removal.

Plan Element Verification

Element	Collection (check if applies)	Public Reporting (check if applies)
Descriptor (a)(1)	X	X

Process for Development/Implementation

Describe the process that the State will use for developing and implementing means to collect or publicly report the required information as soon as possible but no later than September 30, 2011, by using the following questions.

- Development of the plan:
  - What actions will the state take to develop the plan? Currently, Michigan is in the process of developing a designated system to collect annually a description of the evaluation systems that each local education agency (LEA) uses to evaluate the performance of teachers and principals and how those results are used in decisions on teacher development, compensation, promotion, retention, and removal. The results of the survey for each district will be posted on the MDE website at http://www.michigan.gov/mde/0,1607,7-140-6530_30334_51051-228482--,00.html
  - In the current absence of a dedicated system for gathering these data, a state team has developed a survey to collect them. Each LEA has already signed assurances to receive Stabilization II funds and must comply with all reporting requirements. In addition, each LEA will be required to respond to this survey or risk losing their opportunity to apply for the competitive funding under Race to the Top. A list of LEAs not responding to the survey will also be publicly reported on the MDE website at (http://www.michigan.gov/mde/0,1607,7-140-6530_30334_51051-228482--,00.html) The survey will be repeated annually until the dedicated system is in place. Attachment B is the survey that was available for completion on the MDE website.
  - Which state agency or agencies will be responsible for the development of the plan? The Michigan Department of Education (MDE) Office of Professional Preparation Services (OPPS) and the Office of Educational Assessment and Accountability (OEAA) will work with the Center for Educational Performance and Information (CEPI) to publicly report the data gathered from the survey. (OEAA is responsible for the development, administration, and reporting of statewide K–12 achievement assessments upon which student growth would be calculated; and CEPI is the recognized education data collection and reporting agency for the state of Michigan.)

    When the dedicated system is in place, OPPS will work with CEPI to ensure that the data are publicly reported and will work with OEAA and CEPI to ensure that student growth data is adequately included in the evaluations.
  - What evidence is there that the agency or agencies have the capacity to do this? OPPS works with CEPI to collect data for the Registry of Educational Personnel, and the data are collected twice a year. OEAA has developed a student growth model that has been accepted by the USDOE and can be used in the teacher and principal evaluation system.

    - Will any additional institutional infrastructure be necessary to develop this (e.g., a new Web portal or another IT solution)? For the initial survey on the evaluation system, no new infrastructure is needed. For the annual update, MDE will work with CEPI to add necessary fields to one of the existing data-collection systems.

- Implementation of the plan:
    - What actions will the state take to implement the plan? For the initial survey, the state forwarded a letter to LEAs and other relevant educational associations to disseminate information and MDE's website for responding to the survey.

      The state will be providing a reporting mechanism through CEPI portals for schools and districts to provide this information electronically annually.
    - How frequently will the information be collected or publicly reported? Annually.
    - Which state agency or agencies will be responsible for
        - Implementing the plan? MDE (OPPS) and CEPI
        - Monitoring the implementation of the plan? MDE (OPPS and OEAA) and CEPI
    - Other oversight?

      What evidence is there that the agency or agencies have the capacity to do this? MDE has already implemented the plan for the initial survey. For the future, the evidence of capacity is the following: CEPI already has data systems in place to gather information about schools and about individual educators. These additional data can be relatively easily added to the existing data systems.
    - Will any additional institutional infrastructure be necessary to execute this (e.g., a new Web portal or another IT solution)? For the initial survey on the evaluation system, no new infrastructure is needed. For the annual update, MDE will work with CEPI to add necessary fields to one of the existing data-collection systems.

Are there any other obstacles that may prevent the state from developing or executing those means by September 30, 2011 (e.g., requirements and prohibitions of State law and policy)? No.

Technical Assistance Requirements

Describe any technical assistance or support that the state will need for developing and implementing the means to collect or publicly report the required information by using the following questions:

- What technical assistance or support is necessary for the development of the state plan? Incorporating growth measures into evaluations, and professional development for LEA staff responsible for calculating growth/achievement measures for teachers who teach subjects we do not test annually.
- What agencies or organizations will be providing this technical assistance or support? MDE and CEPI.
- What technical assistance or support is necessary for the implementation or oversight of the state plan? None is needed for this part of the plan.
    - Is any outreach or training required? Incorporating growth measures into evaluations, and professional development for LEA staff responsible for calculating growth/achievement measures for teachers who teach subjects we do not test annually.
- What agencies or organizations will be providing this technical assistance or support? MDE and CEPI.

Public Reporting

Describe the public reporting on the development and implementation of the means to collect or publicly report the required information by using the following questions:

- How does the state intend to publicly report the plan? After completion and analysis of the survey data, the state will provide a description of each LEA's teacher evaluation system on the MDE-assigned website. The manner in which each LEA uses the results of the evaluation system will also be publicly reported on the designated website and updated annually.
- How does the state intend to publicly report progress on the plan? Progress on the plan will be reported on the MDE website.
    - What is the nature of the progress reporting? A report on the districts that responded to the survey and those that did not will be reported along with a summary of total number of district responses to the survey items.
    - How frequently will progress be reported? Progress will be reported until 100 percent of districts have responded to the survey, and until the dedicated system is in place.
- Identify the website where the plan and progress reports will be made publicly available. http://www.michigan.gov/mde/0,1607,7-140-6530_30334_51051-228482--,00.html

Budget

Create a budget for the development and implementation, and oversight. Indicate whether funds will be federal, state, local, or a combination.

Task	Budget Amount	Federal/State/Local
Development	$140,000.00	Federal/state
Implementation	$60,000.00	Federal/state
Oversight (field review oversight)	$50,000.00	Federal/state

Timeline

Use the chart below to describe key tasks and milestones that the state will use to measure progress and the estimated completion date of each task.

Key Tasks and Milestones	Estimated Completion Date
Development of survey questions	12/02/09
Finalize questions	12/04/09
Letter to LEAs	12/09/09
Launch survey (post on MDE website)	12/14/09
Close survey	12/22/09
Review by MDE	12/23/09
Follow-up w/ nonresponders	12/23–1/5/10
Reopen survey for nonresponders	12/29/09–1/5/10
Data from survey publicly reported on MDE website	1/11/10
CEPI—survey requirements gathering	February 2010
CEPI—system design development	Summer 2010

Indicator (a)(3): Indicate, for each LEA in the State, whether the systems used to evaluate the performance of teachers include student achievement outcomes or student growth data as an evaluation criterion.

Plan Element Verification

Element	Collection (check if applies)	Public Reporting (check if applies)
Indicator (a)(3)	X	X

Process for Development/Implementation

Describe the process that the State will use for developing and implementing means to collect or publicly report the required information as soon as possible but no later than September 30, 2011 by using the following questions.

- Development of the plan:
  - What actions will the state take to develop the plan? Initially, the Michigan Department of Education (MDE) Office of Professional Preparation Services (OPPS) and Office of Educational Assessment & Accountability (OEAA) have jointly developed a survey to determine the extent to which student achievement outcomes or growth data are used to evaluate the performance of teachers. The survey as developed is provided in Appendix A to Descriptor (a)(1). The results of the survey for each district will be posted on the MDE website at http://www.michigan.gov/mde/0,1607,7-140-6530_30334_51051-228482--,00.html

    OEAA conducts the Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) for elementary and middle school students and the Michigan Merit Examination (MME) for high school students, as well as alternate assessments for students with significant cognitive disabilities. OEAA has also developed a growth model that has been accepted by the United State Department of Education (USED) for use in calculating Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP). OEAA will therefore take the lead responsibility for addressing the student growth requirements as they pertain to inclusion in teachers evaluations.

    In order to address the data gathering and reporting requirements of Indicator (a)(3), MDE will:

    - Work with CEPI to add to its Registry of Educational Personnel (REP), as mentioned in Descriptors (a)(1) and (a)(2), the necessary fields to gather educator performance evaluation reports, including components based on student achievement and/or student growth.
    - Work with CEPI to develop a public reporting system that will make annual educator performance evaluation reports available online through a searchable interface, including educator name, Personal Identification Code (PIC), district, and school.

    In order to encourage comparable student achievement and growth data to be used across LEAs as criteria within educator evaluation systems, as required under Indicator (a)(3), MDE will:

    - Use the USED-approved assessment system to provide measures of student achievement in subjects tested by the MDE, which is already in place.
    - Develop guidelines for developing, creating cut scores for, and using local assessments to provide measures of student proficiency and growth in subjects not tested by the MDE.

- Use the USED-approved growth model to provide measures of student growth in subjects tested annually by the State, which are already in place.
- Use pre-post achievement measures based on state (where available) or local interim/benchmark assessments for all subjects.
- Include only students that educators taught over the period for which the evaluation is being carried out.
- Develop a credit-based effectiveness measure, with a certain number of credits required, as indicated below (target timeline: Fall 2011):

  Although the credit-based effectiveness measure will need to be validated and enhanced based on results and research/analysis, we provide a preliminary look at what this credit-based measure might look like, as follows:

  The credit-based effectiveness measure would be based on the following rules that include both student status and student growth. The reason for including both status and growth is to ensure that the ultimate goal (proficiency) continues to be rewarded, and that progress beyond and or toward proficiency can be additionally weighted as important policy goals of the system. The credits are as follows:

  Credits based on status

  - Award 1.5 credits for each student scoring advanced (Level 1).
  - Award 1.0 credits for each student scoring proficient (Level 2).
  - Award 0 credits for each student scoring below proficient (below Level 2).

  Understanding credits based on Performance Level Change

  Performance Level Change (PLC) is the method used by MDE to identify the progress students have made from the previous grade to the next on reading and mathematics in Grades 4 to 8. MDE uses four performance levels (Advanced, Proficient, Partially Proficient, and Not Proficient). Each of these levels is subdivided into three ranges (low, mid, and high). During standard setting, MDE implemented a vertical articulation methodology to ensure that if a student went from barely partially proficient, barely proficient, or barely advanced in Grade X to barely partially proficient, barely proficient, or barely advanced (respectively) in Grade X+1, those transition represent one year of growth for one year of instruction.

  In addition, transitioning from mid proficient in one grade to mid proficient in the next grade (or any similar transition from a particular range within a performance level to the same range the next grade) represents one year of growth for one year of instruction. Those transitions considered one year of growth for one year of instruction were labeled “maintaining” the performance level. A transition of one or two range improvements was considered an “improvement” in performance level (e.g., from low not proficient to mid not proficient the next year, or from low advanced to high advanced the next year). A transition of more than two range improvements was considered “significant improvement” in performance level. (e.g., from low not proficient to low partially proficient the next year). Likewise, a regression of one or two ranges was considered a “decline” with a regression of more than two ranges being considered a “significant decline.”

  Credits described below are based on whether a student “significantly declined,” “declined,” “maintained,” “improved,” or “significantly improved.”

  Credits based on declining performance level

  - Subtract 1.0 credits for each student showing a “significant decline” in performance level from the previous year.
  - Subtract 0.5 credits for each student showing a “decline” in performance level from the previous year.

Credits based on maintaining performance level

- Award 0 credits for each student showing a "maintenance" of performance level from the previous year.

Credits based on improving performance level

For students who *were* proficient the previous year

- Award 1.0 credits for each student showing a "significant improvement" in performance level from the previous year.
- Award 0.5 credits for each student showing an "improvement" in performance level from the previous year.

For students who *were NOT* proficient the previous year

- Award 2.0 credits for each student showing a "significant improvement" in performance level from the previous year.
- Award 1.5 credits for each student showing an "improvement" in performance level from the previous year.

The policy rationales for the various credits are as follows

1. Proficient achievement is provided a positive credit to address the policy goal of *all* students achieving proficiency.
2. Advanced achievement is provided a greater positive credit to address the policy goal of achieving advanced levels if possible.
3. Declines in performance are given additional negative credits to address the policy goal of not allowing any students to decline relative to proficiency targets. Larger declines are given weightier negative credits.
4. Improvement in performance is given additional positive credits, but the weights are differential depending upon whether a student was or was not previously proficient, with higher positive weights for students who were not previously proficient. This addresses the policy objective that it is important to have students continue to move beyond proficiency, but even more important to have students who have not yet achieved proficiency to move toward proficiency. In addition, larger improvements are given weightier positive credits.

Target credit thresholds

Although the target credit thresholds will need to be evaluated based on results and analysis of the results, a possible set of thresholds could be as follows:

- A "highly effective" educator would be required to achieve N*1.5 credits for N assessments administered (to be consistent with the race to the top definition of 1.5 years of growth for one year of instruction)
- An "effective" educator would be required to achieve N credits for N assessments administered (to be consistent with the race to the top definition of one year of growth for one year of instruction).
- An "ineffective" educator would achieve less than N credits for N assessments administered.
- Based on the credit definitions, there are many ways to achieve these thresholds, but some scenarios are helpful to understand a few ways this could be achieved. They are as follows:

  Scenarios in which a teacher would be identified as "highly effective"

1. Having all students achieve at the “advanced” level
2. Having all students achieve at the “proficient” level, and having all students show, at minimum, “improved” performance over the previous year
3. Having no students achieve at the “proficient” level, but all students demonstrate “improvement,” moving them toward proficiency

Scenarios in which a teacher would be identified as “effective”

1. Having all students achieve at the “proficient” level.
2. Having no students achieve at the “proficient” level, with two thirds of students demonstrating “improvement” toward proficiency, and no students demonstrating a “decline.”
3. Having all students achieve at the “advanced” level, with all students showing a “decline” in proficiency (e.g., although all students declined, they remained in the “advanced” category of achievement)

Scenarios in which a teacher would be identified as “ineffective”

1. Having all students achieve below proficiency with one third showing “improvement,” one third showing “maintenance,” and one third showing a “decline” in performance level.
2. Having all students achieve at the proficient level, with more students showing a “decline” than an “improvement” in performance level.
3. Having all students achieve at the “advanced” level, but all students demonstrate a “decline,” in achievement level with some demonstrating a “significant decline.”

Additional elements

As the state (or the consortia to which the state belong) develops interim/benchmark assessments, a model for measuring student growth on the benchmark assessments will need to be created.

OEAA will produce the measures for annual assessments in reading and mathematics for Grades 4-8 (the only grades and subjects with previous-year measurement at the state level) and in any state-developed interim/benchmark assessments. For other grades and subjects, MDE will:

- Define a model method for LEAs to follow to set proficiency bars on locally developed assessments.
- Define a model method for LEAs to follow to calculate growth/performance level change on locally developed assessments consistent with the methodology to be used for state-developed benchmark assessments.

In addition, MDE will require LEAs to include the credit-based measure of student achievement/growth as a significant portion of their performance evaluations as either provided by OEAA or as defined above for local assessments. Finally, MDE will require LEAs to clearly delineate additional criteria used in principal evaluations.

The system also allows teachers and principals to be held accountable for all assessments that are administered within a school building or classroom since all the assessments that are administered in the current accountability system can be assigned credits under the model.

To encourage that the system be used appropriately, MDE will include in the guidelines that achievement/growth credits would be required to be used formatively for the first three years so that educators have an opportunity to improve based on feedback from the evaluation data. As stated earlier, MDE will provide LEAs with guidance on implementing a multi-faceted evaluation system that uses student achievement/growth data as a significant factor, but not the only factor. Only in the fourth year, after feedback, and appropriate support through mentoring, coaching and professional development, would it be encouraged to use the results of the evaluation system that includes student growth data in promotion, hiring, compensation, retention or termination decisions. This would encourage that the largest weakness of value-added models (that teacher effectiveness measures are built on the assumption that everything about student achievement that cannot be explained by a statistical model is attributable to the individual educator) is addressed by encouraging that the effectiveness measure is stable over time and after support activities and an opportunity to demonstrate improvement if needed.

This credit-based system has a significant advantage of transparency. Although many value-added models are based on complex and sophisticated statistical models, this model can be replicated by anyone with access to the student achievement/growth data. With the understanding that underlying statistical modeling will be needed to ensure that the thresholds and weights are reasonable and valid, this system ensures that there is no black box in the system.

- Which state agency or agencies will be responsible for the development of the plan? The Michigan Department of Education's Office of Professional Preparation Services (OPPS), and the Office of Educational Assessment and Accountability (OEAA) will work with the Center for Educational Performance and Information (CEPI) to publicly report the teacher evaluation data.
- What evidence is there that the agency or agencies have the capacity to do this? An existing CEPI data system (the Registry of Educational Personnel) is already in place, and would serve as the basis for the additional reporting and data collection required under this indicator. The OEAA has already developed a student growth model that has been accepted by the USDOE and can be used in to feed into the teacher and principal evaluation system. Finally, OEAA has a significant Psychometrics, Accountability, Research & Evaluation (PARE) unit who collectively will be able to design, implement, and evaluate the achievement/growth components of the system
- Will any additional institutional infrastructure be necessary to develop this (e.g., a new Web portal or another IT solution)? Yes. New fields will be required in the CEPI Registry of Educational Personnel to hold the student achievement/growth data and the evaluations for individual educators. Although the software necessary for validating the credit-based value added model is available to the PARE unit of OEAA, new routines for implementing the model on a large scale within the existing OEAA data systems will be required.

- Implementation of the plan:
  - What actions will the state take to implement the plan? The actions are listed above.
  - How frequently will the information be collected or publicly reported? Annually.
  - Which state agency or agencies will be responsible for:
    - Implementing the plan? MDE and CEPI
    - Monitoring the implementation of the plan? MDE and CEPI
  - Other oversight?

    What evidence is there that these agency or agencies have the capacity to do this? An existing CEPI data system (the Registry of Educational Personnel) is already in place, and would serve as the basis for the additional reporting and data collection required under this indicator. The OEAA has already developed a student growth model that has been accepted by the USDOE and can be used in to feed into the teacher and principal evaluation system. Finally, OEAA has a significant Psychometrics, Accountability, Research & Evaluation (PARE) unit who collectively will be able to design, implement, and evaluate the achievement/growth components of the system.

- Will any additional institutional infrastructure be necessary to execute this (e.g., a new Web portal or another IT solution)? Yes. New fields will be required in the CEPI Registry of Educational Personnel to hold the student achievement/growth data and the evaluations for individual educators. Although the software necessary for validating the credit-based value added model is available to the PARE unit of OEAA, new routines for implementing the model on a large scale within the existing OEAA data systems will be required.
- Are there any other obstacles that may prevent the state from developing or executing those means by September 30, 2011 (e.g., requirements and prohibitions of State law and policy)? Searchable reports of the data linking student growth to teachers requires at least two years.

Technical Assistance Requirements

Describe any technical assistance or support that the state will need for development and implementing the means to collect or publicly report the required information by using the following questions:

- What technical assistance or support is necessary for the development of the state plan? None is needed for this part of the plan.
- What agencies or organizations will be providing this technical assistance or support? None is needed for this part of the plan.
- What technical assistance or support is necessary for the implementation or oversight of the state plan? None is needed for this part of the plan.
  - Is any outreach or training required? LEAs will need training on using the growth reports for evaluation of teachers along with other performance measures.
- What agencies or organizations will be providing this technical assistance or support? The MDE will work with educational associations, teacher unions, administrators, and teacher preparation institutions to develop and provide training to local districts.

Public Reporting

Describe the public reporting around the development and implementation of the means to collect or publicly report the required information by using the following questions:

- How does the state intend to publicly report the plan? The Plan will be reported on the MDE website.
- How does the state intend to publicly report progress on the plan? Progress on the plan will be reported on the MDE website.
  - What is the nature of the progress reporting? A report on the districts that responded to the survey and those that did not will be reported along with a summary of total number of district responses to the survey items. In addition, progress on the development of the credit-based value added model will be provided to the State Board of Education
  - How frequently will progress be reported? Progress will be reported quarterly until 100% of districts have responded to the survey, and until the system is in place for annual reporting
- Identify the website where the plan and progress reports will be made publicly available. http://www.michigan.gov/mde/0,1607,7-140-6530_30334_51051-228482--,00.html

Budget

Create a budget for the development and implementation, and oversight. Indicate whether funds will be federal, state, local, or a combination.

Task	Budget Amount	Federal/State/Local
Development	$200,000.00	Federal/State
Implementation	$60,000.00	Federal/State
Oversight (field review oversight)	$50,000.00	Federal/State

Timeline

Use the chart below to describe key tasks and milestones that the state will use to measure progress and the estimated completion date of each task.

Key Tasks and Milestones	Estimated Completion Date
Use USED-approved assessment system to provide measures of student achievement in subjects tested by MDE.	Already in place
Use local assessments to provide measures of student proficiency in subjects not tested by MDE.	Fall 2011
Use the USED-Approved growth model to provide measures of student growth in subjects tested annually by MDE.	Already in place
Use pre-post achievement measures based on local interim/benchmark assessments for all subjects.	Fall 2011
Develop and implement a credit-based accountability system.	Fall 2011
Availability of searchable reports	Summer 2013

Indicator (a)(4): Provide, for each LEA in the State whose teachers receive performance ratings or levels through an evaluation system, the number and percentage (including numerator and denominator) of teachers rated at each performance rating or level.

Plan Element Verification

Element	Collection (check if applies)	Public Reporting (check if applies)
Indicator (a)(4)	X	X

Process for Development/Implementation

Describe the process that the State will use for developing and implementing means to collect or publicly report the required information as soon as possible but no later than September 30, 2011 by using the following questions.

- Development of the plan:
  - What actions will the state take to develop the plan? The MDE will conduct a survey of teacher performance ratings at the end of the 2009-10 school-year. Each LEA will be asked to provide the total number of teachers and principals evaluated and the number and percentage of teachers and principals rated in each of the following categories:
    - Ineffective/Unsatisfactory
    - Moderately Effective/Somewhat Satisfactory
    - Effective/Satisfactory
    - Highly Effective

The survey will be conducted during May and June 2010 with the possibility of being extended to July for LEAs that fail to report by June 30, 2010.

The definitions of the effectiveness ratings are those provided in the 2009 Race to the Top Application (CFDA Number 84.395A). These categories are in alignment with the reporting requirements of SFSF and RTTT. LEAs will be required to report the number and percentage of teachers and principals reported in each category in accordance with Indicators (a)(4) and (a)(7). The MDE works with the Center for Educational Performance and Information (CEPI) to collect data on teachers, administrators and other school personnel via the Registry of Educational Personnel (REP). The REP data is collected twice annually (in December and June). In addition, CEPI will add the necessary fields to gather the performance rating categories/levels used by LEAs.

MDE will be providing guidance to LEAs regarding the various components that may be included in teacher and principal evaluation in addition to student growth data. MDE's Office of Professional Preparation Services (OPPS) is in the process of working with various stakeholders to develop and implement an observational rubric for the performance assessment of teachers based on the Professional Standards for Michigan Teachers (PSMT) and the Profile of Teacher Knowledge and Skills (PTKS) http://www.michigan.gov/documents/mde/SBE_approved_PSMT_May_13_2008+coverpg_258601_7.doc). A similar performance assessment will be developed for principals using the Standards for Principal Preparation (http://www.michigan.gov/documents/SBE_Item_Stds_for_Prep_of_School_Principals_Feb_04_86551_7.doc). In addition to the student growth data and the observation performance assessments, LEAs may choose other assessment tools to use as a part of the overall multi-faceted teacher and principal evaluation systems.

CEPI works with the Department of Information Technology (DIT) to develop and design the data reporting systems and public access to such data. CEPI also works with DIT to import the information on professional school personnel licenses from the License 2000 (L2K) educator licensure database into the REP. The coordination between the two databases provides a mechanism for monitoring to ensure that teachers are being assigned to teach in the areas in which they are endorsed or credentialed. MDE will work with CEPI to add the necessary fields on evaluation to the REP data collection. All teachers in Michigan are certificated and appropriately placed in classrooms, regardless of their preparation route. MDE currently has a contract with an outside vendor to complete the rewrite of its L2K educator licensure database. Enhancements to this database will include cross system alignment with the REP so that a common personal identification code (PIC) can be used to track teacher performance based on student achievement data back to the recommending teacher preparation institution.

CEPI compiles the reports that will be shared with the general public on the MDE's website. The teacher and principal effectiveness data, which is linked to student growth will also be shared with other offices in MDE that design and deliver professional development for teachers and principals. It is expected that CEPI will add the new fields to the REP in time for the June 2013 end of year data collection.

MDE and CEPI will work to implement the two major data collection and reporting requirements related to reporting growth of student achievement by school and teacher and using the growth data as part of the evaluations of principals and teachers. CEPI plans to start development of data definitions and to modify its data collection applications as soon as possible. The timelines are based on using feeder codes to report student growth data by teacher based on the links between students and teachers during the school year prior to the initial reporting. The reason for this requirement is that Michigan's student assessments are administered in the fall and reflect learning during the previous school year.

MDE will develop and implement training to LEAs on how to conduct multi-faceted teacher and principal evaluations and reporting requirements.
CEPI would begin collecting the teacher/student links in the fall 2011 Michigan Student Data System (MSDS) collection. Since these links represent teacher/student relationships in the 2011–12 school year, the first student growth reports would be available in winter 2013 based on comparing student achievement in fall 2013 with achievement in the fall of 2012. The student growth data must be based on two years of data in order to assess the effectiveness of teachers and principals. The advantages to this collection schedule are:

- It provides more lead time for districts and vendors between the release of data specifications and the initial collection of teacher/student links.
- Collecting teacher/student links at the beginning of the school year coincides with assignment of students to teachers at the beginning of the year.
- Districts typically have staff available during the fall to comply with the reporting requirements.
    - Which state agency or agencies will be responsible for the development of the plan? The Michigan Department of Education's Office of Professional Preparation Services (OPPS), and the Office of Educational Assessment and Accountability (OEAA) will work with the Center for Educational Performance and Information (CEPI) to publicly report the teacher evaluation data.
    - What evidence is there that the agency or agencies have the capacity to do this? OPPS works with CEPI to collect the Registry of Educational Personnel, which is done twice a year. CEPI is the recognized data collection and reporting agency for the state of Michigan. OEAA is responsible for conducting the annual Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) for elementary and middle school students and the Michigan Merit Examination (MME) for high school students. The OEAA has developed a student growth model that has been accepted by the USDOE and can be used in the teacher and principal evaluation system.

- Will any additional institutional infrastructure be necessary to develop this (e.g., a new Web portal or another IT solution)? At this point no additional institutional infrastructure will be necessary.

- Implementation of the plan:
  - What actions will the state take to implement the plan? See timeline.
  - How frequently will the information be collected or publicly reported? Annually.
  - Which state agency or agencies will be responsible for:
    - Implementing the plan--MDE
    - Monitoring the implementation of the plan? MDE
    - Other oversight?

      What evidence is there that these agency or agencies have the capacity to do this? The MDE's OPPS, OEAA and CEPI will work collaboratively to provide the oversight for this part of the plan.
  - Will any additional institutional infrastructure be necessary to execute this (e.g., a new Web portal or another IT solution)? No, not at this time.
  - Are there any other obstacles that may prevent the state from developing or executing those means by September 30, 2011 (e.g., requirements and prohibitions of State law and policy)? Searchable reports of the data linking student growth to teachers requires at least two years. The first report will not be available until 2013 (see timeline below)

Technical Assistance Requirements

Describe any technical assistance or support that the state will need for development and implementing the means to collect or publicly report the required information by using the following questions:

- What technical assistance or support is necessary for the development of the state plan? None is needed for this part of the plan.
- What agencies or organizations will be providing this technical assistance or support? None is needed for this part of the plan.
- What technical assistance or support is necessary for the implementation or oversight of the state plan? None is needed for this part of the plan.
  - Is any outreach or training required? LEAs will need training on using the growth reports for evaluation of teachers along with other performance measures.
- What agencies or organizations will be providing this technical assistance or support? The MDE will work with educational associations, teacher unions, administrators, and teacher preparation institutions to develop and provide training to local districts.

Public Reporting

Describe the public reporting around the development and implementation of the means to collect or publicly report the required information by using the following questions:

- How does the state intend to publicly report the plan? The Plan will be reported on the MDE website.
- How does the state intend to publicly report progress on the plan? Progress on the plan will be reported on the MDE website.
  - What is the nature of the progress reporting? A report on the districts that responded to the survey and those that did not will be reported along with a summary of total number of district responses to the survey items.

- How frequently will progress be reported? Progress will be reported quarterly until 100% of districts have responded to the survey.

- Identify the website where the plan and progress reports will be made publicly available. http://www.michigan.gov/mde/0,1607,7-140-6530_30334_51051-228482--,00.html

Budget

Create a budget for the development and implementation, and oversight. Indicate whether funds will be federal, state, local, or a combination.

Task	Budget Amount	Federal/State/Local
Development	$200,000.00	Federal/State
Implementation	$60,000.00	Federal/State
Oversight (field review oversight)	$50,000.00	Federal/State

Timeline

NOTE: The chart below describes key tasks and milestones in a coordinated schedule addressing both teacher and principal evaluation. The same timeline is used for other indicators dealing with teacher and/or principal evaluation.

Key Tasks and Milestone	Estimated Completion Date
Develop data definitions for Michigan Student Data System (MSDS) and Registry of Educational Personnel (REP)	Winter 2010
• MSDS to gather links from student to teacher and subject	N/A
• REP to gather effectiveness ratings of teachers and principals	N/A
Report Student Achievement Growth by School 2008–09	Winter 2010
MSDS used to assign 2008–09 feeder codes and full academic year status.	Winter 2010
Initial reports on principal evaluations.	Winter 2010
Reports of Student Achievement Growth by School (fall 2008 to fall 2009) based on feeder codes for full academic year students.	Spring 2010
Deadline for LEAs to respond to survey on teacher and principal evaluation categories.	Summer 2010
Create preliminary school effectiveness measures based on achievement and growth.	Summer 2010
Initial collection of principal evaluations.	Fall 2010
Requirements gathering for reports on principal evaluations	Fall 2010
Modify and test MSDS to add student/teacher and subject links	Spring 2011
Create final school effectiveness measures based on achievement and growth.	Summer 2011
LEAs use school effectiveness measures to inform principal evaluations.	Summer 2011
Initial collection of student/teacher links and subjects in MSDS	Fall 2011
• Students take assessments	Fall 2011
• MSDS used to assign 2010-11 feeder codes and full academic year status.	Fall 2012
• Reports of student achievement growth by teacher (fall 2009 to fall 2010)	Winter 2012

based on student/teacher links for 2009–10 school year. Reports based on feeder codes for full academic year students.	
Notify LEAs and vendors of new data collection requirements.	Winter 2011
Modify REP to collect evaluation labels for principals.	Winter 2011
Create preliminary teacher effectiveness measures based on achievement and growth.	Winter 2012
Modify REP to collect evaluation labels for teachers.	Summer 2012
Create final teacher effectiveness measures based on achievement and growth.	Spring 2012
LEAs use effectiveness measures to inform teacher evaluations.	Spring 2012
Initial collection of teacher evaluations.	Fall 2012
Requirements gathering for reports on teacher evaluations.	Fall 2012
Initial reports on teacher evaluations.	Winter 2013
Searchable reports on teacher and principal evaluations available through portal.	Summer 2013
LEAs use school effectiveness measures to inform principal promotion, tenure, hiring, compensation and retention decisions.	Spring 2014
LEAs use teacher effectiveness measures to inform teacher promotion, tenure, hiring, compensation and retention decisions.	Spring 2015

The data gathered by CEPI will be used to produce additional public reports on student growth, teacher and principal evaluation systems as required for both the SFSF and RTTT grants.

Indicator (a)(5): Indicate, for each LEA in the State whose teachers receive performance ratings or levels through an evaluation system, whether the number and percentage (including numerator and denominator) of teachers rated at each performance rating or level are publicly reported for each school in the LEA.

Plan Element Verification

Element	Collection (check if applies)	Public Reporting (check if applies)
Indicator (a)(5)	X	X

Process for Development/Implementation

Describe the process that the State will use for developing and implementing means to collect or publicly report the required information as soon as possible but no later than September 30, 2011 by using the following questions.

- Development of the plan:
  - What actions will the state take to develop the plan? The MDE will conduct a survey of teacher performance ratings at the end of the 2009-10 school-year. Each LEA will be asked to provide the total number of teachers and principals evaluated and the number and percentage of teachers and principals rated in each of the following categories:
    - Ineffective/Unsatisfactory
    - Moderately Effective/Somewhat Satisfactory
    - Effective/Satisfactory
    - Highly Effective

The survey will be conducted during May and June 2010 with the possibility of being extended to July for LEAs that fail to report by June 30, 2010.

o

The definitions of the effectiveness ratings are those provided in the 2009 Race to the Top Application (CFDA Number 84.395A). These categories are in alignment with the reporting requirements of SFSF and RTTT. LEAs will be required to report the number and percentage of teachers and principals reported in each category in accordance with Indicators (a)(4) and (a)(7). The MDE works with the Center for Educational Performance and Information (CEPI) to collect data on teachers, administrators and other school personnel via the Registry of Educational Personnel (REP). The REP data is collected twice annually (in December and June). In addition, CEPI will add the necessary fields to gather the performance rating categories/levels used by LEAs.

MDE will be providing guidance to LEAs regarding the various components that may be included in teacher and principal evaluation in addition to student growth data. MDE's Office of Professional Preparation Services (OPPS) is in the process of working with various stakeholders to develop and implement an observational rubric for the performance assessment of teachers based on the Professional Standards for Michigan Teachers (PSMT) and the Profile of Teacher Knowledge and Skills (PTKS) http://www.michigan.gov/documents/mde/SBE_approved_PSMT_May_13_2008+coverpg_258601_7.doc. A similar performance assessment will be developed for principals using the Standards for Principal Preparation (http://www.michigan.gov/documents/SBE_Item_Stds_for_Prep_of_School_Principals_Feb_04_86551_7.

doc). In addition to the student growth data and the observation performance assessments, LEAs may choose other assessment tools to use as a part of the overall multi-faceted teacher and principal evaluation systems.

CEPI works with the Department of Information Technology (DIT) to develop and design the data reporting systems and public access to such data. CEPI also works with DIT to import the information on professional school personnel licenses from the License 2000 (L2K) educator licensure database into the REP. The coordination between the two databases provides a mechanism for monitoring to ensure that teachers are being assigned to teach in the areas in which they are endorsed or credentialed. MDE will work with CEPI to add the necessary fields on evaluation to the REP data collection. All teachers in Michigan are certificated and appropriately placed in classrooms, regardless of their preparation route. MDE currently has a contract with an outside vendor to complete the rewrite of its L2K educator licensure database. Enhancements to this database will include cross system alignment with the REP so that a common personal identification code (PIC) can be used to track teacher performance based on student achievement data back to the recommending teacher preparation institution.

CEPI compiles the reports that will be shared with the general public on the MDE's website. The teacher and principal effectiveness data, which is linked to student growth will also be shared with other offices in MDE that design and deliver professional development for teachers and principals. It is expected that CEPI will add the new fields to the REP in time for the June 2013 end of year data collection.

MDE and CEPI will work to implement the two major data collection and reporting requirements related to reporting growth of student achievement by school and teacher and using the growth data as part of the evaluations of principals and teachers. CEPI plans to start development of data definitions and to modify its data collection applications as soon as possible. The timelines are based on using feeder codes to report student growth data by teacher based on the links between students and teachers during the school year prior to the initial reporting. The reason for this requirement is that Michigan's student assessments are administered in the fall and reflect learning during the previous school year.
MDE will develop and implement training to LEAs on how to conduct multi-faceted teacher and principal evaluations and reporting requirements.

CEPI would begin collecting the teacher/student links in the fall 2011 Michigan Student Data System (MSDS) collection. Since these links represent teacher/student relationships in the 2011-12 school year, the first student growth reports would be available in winter 2013 based on comparing student achievement in fall 2013 with achievement in the fall of 2012. The student growth data must be based on two years of data in order o assess the effectiveness of teachers and principals. The advantages to this collection schedule are:

- It provides more lead time for districts and vendors between the release of data specifications and the initial collection of teacher/student links.
- Collecting teacher/student links at the beginning of the school year coincides with assignment of students to teachers at the beginning of the year.
- Districts typically have staff available during the fall to comply with the reporting requirements.

- Which state agency or agencies will be responsible for the development of the plan? The Michigan Department of Education's Office of Professional Preparation Services (OPPS), and the Office of Educational Assessment and Accountability (OEAA) will work with the Center for Educational Performance and Information (CEPI) to publicly report the teacher evaluation data.
- What evidence is there that the agency or agencies have the capacity to do this? OPPS works with CEPI to collect the Registry of Educational Personnel, which is done twice a year. CEPI is the recognized data collection and reporting agency for the state of Michigan. OEAA is responsible for conducting the annual Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) for elementary and middle school students and the Michigan Merit Examination (MME) for high school students. The OEAA has developed a student growth model that has been accepted by the USDOE and can be used in the teacher and principal evaluation system.

- Will any additional institutional infrastructure be necessary to develop this (e.g., a new Web portal or another IT solution)? At this point no additional institutional infrastructure will be necessary.

- Implementation of the plan:
  - What actions will the state take to implement the plan? See timeline.
  - How frequently will the information be collected or publicly reported? Annually.
  - Which state agency or agencies will be responsible for:
    - Implementing the plan--MDE
    - Monitoring the implementation of the plan? MDE
    - Other oversight?
  - What evidence is there that these agency or agencies have the capacity to do this? The MDE's OPPS, OEAA and CEPI will work collaboratively to provide the oversight for this part of the plan.
  - Will any additional institutional infrastructure be necessary to execute this (e.g., a new Web portal or another IT solution)? No, not at this time.
  - Are there any other obstacles that may prevent the state from developing or executing those means by September 30, 2011 (e.g., requirements and prohibitions of State law and policy)? Searchable reports of the data linking student growth to teachers requires at least two years. The first report will not be available until 2013 (see timeline below)

Technical Assistance Requirements

Describe any technical assistance or support that the state will need for development and implementing the means to collect or publicly report the required information by using the following questions:

- What technical assistance or support is necessary for the development of the state plan? None is needed for this part of the plan.
- What agencies or organizations will be providing this technical assistance or support? None is needed for this part of the plan.
- What technical assistance or support is necessary for the implementation or oversight of the state plan? None is needed for this part of the plan.
  - Is any outreach or training required? LEAs will need training on using the growth reports for evaluation of teachers along with other performance measures.
- What agencies or organizations will be providing this technical assistance or support? The MDE will work with educational associations, teacher unions, administrators, and teacher preparation institutions to develop and provide training to local districts.

Public Reporting

Describe the public reporting around the development and implementation of the means to collect or publicly report the required information by using the following questions:

- How does the state intend to publicly report the plan? The Plan will be reported on the MDE website.
- How does the state intend to publicly report progress on the plan? Progress on the plan will be reported on the MDE website.
  - What is the nature of the progress reporting? A report on the districts that responded to the survey and those that did not will be reported along with a summary of total number of district responses to the survey items.

- How frequently will progress be reported? Progress will be reported quarterly until 100% of districts have responded to the survey.

- Identify the website where the plan and progress reports will be made publicly available. http://www.michigan.gov/mde/0,1607,7-140-6530_30334_51051-228482--,00.html

Budget

Create a budget for the development and implementation, and oversight. Indicate whether funds will be federal, state, local, or a combination.

Task	Budget Amount	Federal/State/Local
Development	$200,000.00	Federal/State
Implementation	$60,000.00	Federal/State
Oversight (field review oversight)	$50,000.00	Federal/State

Timeline

Use the chart below to describe key tasks and milestones that the state will use to measure progress and the estimated completion date of each task.

Key Tasks and Milestone	Estimated Completion Date
Develop data definitions for Michigan Student Data System (MSDS) and Registry of Educational Personnel (REP)	Winter 2010
• MSDS to gather links from student to teacher and subject	N/A
• REP to gather effectiveness ratings of teachers and principals	N/A
Report Student Achievement Growth by School 2008–09	Winter 2010
MSDS used to assign 2008–09 feeder codes and full academic year status.	Winter 2010
Initial reports on principal evaluations.	Winter 2010
Reports of Student Achievement Growth by School (fall 2008 to fall 2009) based on feeder codes for full academic year students.	Spring 2010
Deadline for LEAs to respond to survey on teacher and principal evaluation categories.	Summer 2010
Create preliminary school effectiveness measures based on achievement and growth.	Summer 2010
Initial collection of principal evaluations.	Fall 2010
Requirements gathering for reports on principal evaluations	Fall 2010
Modify and test MSDS to add student/teacher and subject links	Spring 2011
Create final school effectiveness measures based on achievement and growth.	Summer 2011
LEAs use school effectiveness measures to inform principal evaluations.	Summer 2011
Initial collection of student/teacher links and subjects in MSDS	Fall 2011
• Students take assessments	Fall 2011
• MSDS used to assign 2010-11 feeder codes and full academic year status.	Fall 2012

• Reports of student achievement growth by teacher (fall 2009 to fall 2010) based on student/teacher links for 2009–10 school year. Reports based on feeder codes for full academic year students.	Winter 2012
Notify LEAs and vendors of new data collection requirements.	Winter 2011
Modify REP to collect evaluation labels for principals.	Winter 2011
Create preliminary teacher effectiveness measures based on achievement and growth.	Winter 2012
Modify REP to collect evaluation labels for teachers.	Summer 2012
Create final teacher effectiveness measures based on achievement and growth.	Spring 2012
LEAs use effectiveness measures to inform teacher evaluations.	Spring 2012
Initial collection of teacher evaluations.	Fall 2012
Requirements gathering for reports on teacher evaluations.	Fall 2012
Initial reports on teacher evaluations.	Winter 2013
Searchable reports on teacher and principal evaluations available through portal.	Summer 2013
LEAs use school effectiveness measures to inform principal promotion, tenure, hiring, compensation and retention decisions.	Spring 2014
LEAs use teacher effectiveness measures to inform teacher promotion, tenure, hiring, compensation and retention decisions.	Spring 2015

The data gathered by CEPI will be used to produce additional public reports on student growth, teacher and principal evaluation systems as required for both the SFSF and RTTT grants.

Descriptor (a)(2): Describe, for each LEA in the State, the systems used to evaluate the performance of principals and the use of results from those systems in decisions regarding principal development, compensation, promotion, retention, and removal.

Plan Element Verification

Element	Collection (check if applies)	Public Reporting (check if applies)
Descriptor (a)(2)	X	X

Process for Development/Implementation

Describe the process that the State will use for developing and implementing means to collect or publicly report the required information as soon as possible but no later than September 30, 2011 by using the following questions.

- Development of the plan:
  - What actions will the state take to develop the plan? Currently, Michigan is in the process of developing a designated system to put in place to collect annually a description of the evaluation systems that each local education agency (LEA) uses to evaluate the performance of teachers and principals and how those results are used in decisions regarding teacher development, compensation, promotion, retention and removal. The results of the survey for each district will be posted on the MDE website at http://www.michigan.gov/mde/0,1607,7-140-6530_30334_51051-228482--,00.html
  - In the current absence of a dedicated system for gathering these data, a state team has developed a survey to collect this data. Each LEA will be required to respond to this survey or risk losing their opportunity to apply for the competitive funding under Race to the Top. The survey will be repeated annually until the dedicated system is in place.
  - Attachment B is the survey that was available for completion on the MDE website.
  - Which state agency or agencies will be responsible for the development of the plan? The Michigan Department of Education (MDE) Office of Professional Preparation Services (OPPS), and the Office of Educational Assessment and Accountability (OEAA) will work with the Center for Educational Performance and Information (CEPI) to publicly report the data gathered from the survey. (OEAA is responsible for the development, administration and reporting of statewide K–12 achievement assessments upon which student growth would be calculated; and CEPI is the recognized education data collection and reporting agency for the state of Michigan).
  - What evidence is there that the agency or agencies have the capacity to do this? OPPS works with CEPI to collect data for the Registry of Educational Personnel, which is done twice a year. The OEAA has developed a student growth model that has been accepted by the USDOE and can be used in the teacher and principal evaluation system. The evidence lies in the existing systems and the relatively small changes to existing systems that would need to be put into place to ensure that these data are collected and reported annually.
  - Will any additional institutional infrastructure be necessary to develop this (e.g., a new Web portal or another IT solution)? For the initial survey on the evaluation system, no new

infrastructure is needed. For the annual update, MDE will work with CEPI to add necessary fields to one of the existing data collection system.

- Implementation of the plan:
  - What actions will the state take to implement the plan? For the initial survey, the state forwarded a letter to LEAs, and other relevant educational associations to disseminate information and MDE's website for responding to the survey.
  - Going forward, the state will provide a reporting mechanism through CEPI portals for schools and districts to provide this information electronically on an annual basis.
  - How frequently will the information be collected or publicly reported? Annually.
  - Which state agency or agencies will be responsible for:
    - Implementing the plan? MDE (OPPS) and CEPI
    - Monitoring the implementation of the plan? MDE (OPPS and OEAA) and CEPI
    - Other oversight?

      What evidence is there that these agency or agencies have the capacity to do this? MDE has already implemented the plan for the initial survey. Going forward, the evidence of capacity is the following: CEPI already has data systems in place to gather information about schools and about individual educators. These additional data can be relatively easily added to the existing data systems.
  - Will any additional institutional infrastructure be necessary to execute this (e.g., a new Web portal or another IT solution)? For the initial survey on the evaluation system, no new infrastructure is needed. For the annual update, MDE will work with CEPI to add necessary fields to one of the existing data collection system.
  - Are there any other obstacles that may prevent the state from developing or executing those means by September 30, 2011 (e.g., requirements and prohibitions of State law and policy)? No.

Technical Assistance Requirements

Describe any technical assistance or support that the state will need for development and implementing the means to collect or publicly report the required information by using the following questions:

- What technical assistance or support is necessary for the development of the state plan? None is needed for this part of the plan.
- What agencies or organizations will be providing this technical assistance or support? None is needed for this part of the plan.
- What technical assistance or support is necessary for the implementation or oversight of the state plan? None is needed for this part of the plan.
  - Is any outreach or training required? No.
- What agencies or organizations will be providing this technical assistance or support? None is needed for this part of the plan.

Public Reporting

Describe the public reporting around the development and implementation of the means to collect or publicly report the required information by using the following questions:

- How does the state intend to publicly report the plan? After completion and analysis of the survey data, the state will provide a description of each LEAs principal evaluation system on the MDE assigned website. The manner in which each LEA uses the results of the evaluation system will also be publicly reported on the designated website and updated annually.
- How does the state intend to publicly report progress on the plan? Progress on the plan will be reported on the MDE website.

What is the nature of the progress reporting? A report on the districts that responded to the survey and those that did not will be reported along with a summary of total number of district responses to the survey items.

- How frequently will progress be reported? Progress will be reported quarterly until 100% of districts have responded to the survey, and until the dedicated system is in place.
- Identify the website where the plan and progress reports will be made publicly available. http://www.michigan.gov/mde/0,1607,7-140-6530_30334_51051-228482--,00.html

Budget

Create a budget for the development and implementation, and oversight. Indicate whether funds will be federal, state, local, or a combination.

Task	Budget Amount	Federal/State/Local
Development	$140,000.00	Federal/State
Implementation	$60,000.00	Federal/State
Oversight (field review oversight)	$50,000.00	Federal/State

Timeline

Use the chart below to describe key tasks and milestones that the state will use to measure progress and the estimated completion date of each task.

Key Tasks and Milestones	Estimated Completion Date
Development of survey questions	12/02/09
Finalize Questions	12/04/09
Letter to LEAs	12/09/09
Launch Survey (post on MDE website)	12/14/09
Close Survey	12/22/09
Review by MDE	12/23/09
Follow-up w/non-responders	12/23-1/5/10
Re-open survey for non-responders	12/29/09-1/5/10
Data from survey publicly reported on MDE website	1/11/10
CEPI- Survey requirements gathering	February 2010
CEPI—System design development	Summer 2010

Indicator (a)(6): Indicate, for each LEA in the State, whether the systems used to evaluate the performance of principals include student achievement outcomes or student growth data as an evaluation criterion.

Plan Element Verification

Element	Collection (check if applies)	Public Reporting (check if applies)
Indicator (a)(6)	X	X

Process for Development/Implementation

Describe the process that the State will use for developing and implementing means to collect or publicly report the required information as soon as possible but no later than September 30, 2011 by using the following questions.

- Development of the plan:
  - What actions will the state take to develop the plan? Initially, the Michigan Department of Education (MDE) Office of Professional Preparation Services (OPPS) and Office of Educational Assessment & Accountability (OEAA) have jointly developed a survey to determine the extent to which student achievement outcomes or growth data are used to evaluate the performance of principals. The survey as developed is provided in Attachment B to Descriptor (a)(1). The results of the survey for each district will be posted on the MDE website at http://www.michigan.gov/mde/0,1607,7-140-6530_30334_51051-228482--,00.html

    OEAA conducts the Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) for elementary and middle school students and the Michigan Merit Examination (MME) for high school students, as well as alternate assessments for students with significant cognitive disabilities. OEAA has also developed a growth model that has been accepted by the United States Department of Education (USED) for use in calculating Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP). OEAA will therefore take the lead responsibility for addressing the student achievement/growth requirements as they pertain to the effectiveness of principals at the whole school level.

    In order to address the data gathering and reporting requirements of Indicator (a)(6), MDE will:

    - Work with CEPI to add to its Registry of Educational Personnel (REP), as mentioned in Descriptors (a)(1) and (a)(2), the necessary fields to gather educator performance evaluation reports, including components based on student achievement and/or student growth.
    - Work with CEPI to develop a public reporting system that will make annual educator performance evaluation reports available online through a searchable interface, including educator name, district, and school.

    In order to encourage comparable student achievement and growth data are used across LEAs as criteria within educator evaluation systems, as required under Indicator (a)(3), MDE will:

    - Use the USED-approved assessment system to provide measures of student achievement in subjects tested by the MDE, which is already in place.

- Develop guidelines for LEAs to develop, create cut scores, and use local assessments to provide measures of student proficiency and growth in subjects not tested by the MDE.
- Use the USED-approved growth model to provide measures of student growth in subjects tested annually by the State, which are already in place.
- Use pre-post achievement measures based on state (where available) or local interim/benchmark assessments for all subjects.
- Include only students that educators taught over the period for which the evaluation is being carried out.
- Develop a model credit-based effectiveness measure, with a certain number of credits required, as indicated below (target timeline: Fall 2011):

  Although the credit-based effectiveness measure will need to be validated and enhanced based on results and research/analysis, we provide a preliminary look at what this credit-based measure might look like, as follows:

  The credit-based effectiveness measure would be based on the following rules that include both student status and student growth. The reason for including both status and growth is to ensure that the ultimate goal (proficiency) continues to be awarded, and that progress beyond and or toward proficiency can be additionally weighted as important policy goals of the system. The credits are as follows:

  Credits based on status:

  - Award 1.5 credits for each student scoring advanced (Level 1).
  - Award 1.0 credits for each student scoring proficient (Level 2).
  - Award 0 credits for each student scoring below proficient (below Level 2).

  Understanding credits based on Performance Level Change

  Performance Level Change (PLC) is the method used by MDE to identify the progress students have made from the previous grade to the next on reading and mathematics in Grades 4 to 8. MDE uses four performance levels (Advanced, Proficient, Partially Proficient, and Not Proficient). Each of these levels is subdivided into three ranges (low, mid, and high). During standard setting, MDE implemented a vertical articulation methodology to ensure that if a student went from barely partially proficient, barely proficient, or barely advanced in Grade X to barely partially proficient, barely proficient, or barely advanced (respectively) in Grade X+1, those transition represent one year of growth for one year of instruction.

  In addition, transitioning from mid proficient in one grade to mid proficient in the next grade (or any similar transition from a particular range within a performance level to the same range the next grade) represents one year of growth for one year of instruction. Those transitions considered one year of growth for one year of instruction were labeled “maintaining” the performance level. A transition of one or two range improvements was considered an “improvement” in performance level (e.g., from low not proficient to mid not proficient the next year, or from low advanced to high advanced the next year). A transition of more than two range improvements was considered “significant improvement” in performance level. (e.g., from low not proficient to low partially proficient the next year). Likewise, a regression of one or two ranges was considered a “decline” with a regression of more than two ranges being considered a “significant decline.”

  Credits described below are based on whether a student “significantly declined,” “declined,” “maintained,” “improved,” or “significantly improved.”

Credits based on declining performance level

- Subtract 1.0 credits for each student showing a “significant decline” in performance level from the previous year.
- Subtract 0.5 credits for each student showing a “decline” in performance level from the previous year.

Credits based on maintaining performance level

- Award 0 credits for each student showing a “maintenance” of performance level from the previous year.

Credits based on improving performance level

For students who *were* proficient the previous year

- Award 1.0 credits for each student showing a “significant improvement” in performance level from the previous year.
- Award 0.5 credits for each student showing an “improvement” in performance level from the previous year.

For students who *were NOT* proficient the previous year

- Award 2.0 credits for each student showing a “significant improvement” in performance level from the previous year.
- Award 1.5 credits for each student showing an “improvement” in performance level from the previous year.

The policy rationales for the differential credit are as follows.

1. Proficient achievement is provided a positive credit to address the policy goal of *all* students achieving proficiency.
2. Advanced achievement is provided a greater positive credit to address the policy goal of achieving advanced levels if possible.
3. Declines in performance are given additional negative credits to address the policy goal of not allowing any students to decline relative to proficiency targets. Larger declines are given weightier negative credits.
4. Improvement in performance is given additional positive credits, but the weights are differential depending upon whether a student was or was not previously proficient, with higher positive weights for students who were not previously proficient. This addresses the policy objective that it is important to have students continue to move beyond proficiency, but even more important to have students who have not yet achieved proficiency to move toward proficiency. In addition, larger improvements are given weightier positive credits.

Target credit thresholds:

Although the target credit thresholds will need to be evaluated based on results and analysis of the results, a possible set of thresholds could be as follows:

- A “highly effective” principal would be required to achieve N*1.5 credits for N assessments administered (to be consistent with the race to the top definition of 1.5 years of growth for one year of instruction)
- An “effective” principal would be required to achieve N credits for N assessments administered (to be consistent with the race to the top definition of one year of growth for one year of instruction).

- An “ineffective” principal would achieve less than N credits for N assessments administered.

Based on the credit definitions, there are many ways to achieve these thresholds, but some scenarios are helpful to understand a few ways this could be achieved. They are as follows:

Scenarios in which a principal would be identified as “highly effective”

1. Having all students achieve at the “advanced” level
2. Having all students achieve at the “proficient” level, and having all students show, at minimum, “improved” performance over the previous year
3. Having no students achieve at the “proficient” level, but all students demonstrate “improvement,” moving them toward proficiency

Scenarios in which a principal would be identified as “effective”

1. Having all students achieve at the “proficient” level.
2. Having no students achieve at the “proficient” level, with two thirds of students demonstrating “improvement” toward proficiency, and no students demonstrating a “decline.”
3. Having all students achieve at the “advanced” level, with all students showing a “decline” in proficiency (e.g., although all students declined, they remained in the “advanced” category of achievement)

Scenarios in which a principal would be identified as “ineffective”

1. Having all students achieve below proficiency with one third showing “improvement,” one third showing “maintenance,” and one third showing a “decline” in performance level.
2. Having all students achieve at the proficient level, with more students showing a “decline” than an “improvement” in performance level.
3. Having all students achieve at the “advanced” level, but all students demonstrate a “decline,” in achievement level with some demonstrating a “significant decline.”

Additional elements

As the state (or the consortia to which the state belongs) develops interim/benchmark assessments, a model for measuring student growth on the benchmark assessments will need to be created.

OEAA will produce the measures for annual assessments in reading and mathematics for Grades 4-8 (the only grades and subjects with previous-year measurement at the state level) and in any state-developed interim/benchmark assessments. For other grades and subjects, MDE will:

- Define a model method LEA to follow to set proficiency bars on locally developed assessments.
- Define a model method for LEAs to follow to calculate growth/performance level change on locally developed assessments consistent with the methodology to be used for state-developed benchmark assessments.

In addition, MDE will require LEAs to include the credit-based measure of student achievement/growth as a significant portion of their performance evaluations as either provided by OEAA or as defined above for local assessments. Finally, MDE will require LEAs to clearly delineate additional criteria used in principal evaluations.

The system also allows teachers and principals to be held accountable for all assessments that are administered within a school building or classroom since all the assessments that are administered in the current accountability system can be assigned credits under the model.

To encourage the system is being used appropriately, MDE will include in the guidelines that achievement/growth credits should be used formatively for the first three years so that principals have an opportunity to improve based on feedback from the evaluation data. As stated earlier, MDE will provide LEAs with guidance on implementing a multi-faceted evaluation system that uses student achievement/growth data as a significant factor, but not the only factor. Only in the fourth year, after feedback, and appropriate support through mentoring, coaching and professional development, would it be encouraged to use the results of the evaluation system that includes student growth data in promotion, hiring, compensation, retention or termination decisions. This would address the largest weakness of value-added models (that principal measures are built on the assumption that everything about student achievement that cannot be explained by a statistical model is attributable to the individual principal) is addressed by encouraging that the effectiveness measure is stable over time and after support activities and an opportunity to demonstrate improvement if needed.

This credit-based system has a significant advantage of transparency. Although many value-added models are based on complex and sophisticated statistical models, this model can be replicated by anyone with access to the student achievement/growth data. With the understanding that underlying statistical modeling will be needed to ensure that the thresholds and weights are reasonable and valid, this system ensures that there is no black box in the system.

- Which state agency or agencies will be responsible for the development of the plan? The Michigan Department of Education's Office of Professional Preparation Services (OPPS), and the Office of Educational Assessment and Accountability (OEAA) will work with the Center for Educational Performance and Information (CEPI) to publicly report the teacher evaluation data.
- What evidence is there that the agency or agencies have the capacity to do this? An existing CEPI data system (the Registry of Educational Personnel) is already in place, and would serve as the basis for the additional reporting and data collection required under this indicator. The OEAA has already developed a student growth model that has been accepted by the USDOE and can be used in to feed into the teacher and principal evaluation system. Finally, OEAA has a significant Psychometrics, Accountability, Research & Evaluation unit who collectively will be able to design, implement, and evaluate the achievement/growth components of the system
- Will any additional institutional infrastructure be necessary to develop this (e.g., a new Web portal or another IT solution)? Yes. New fields will be required in the CEPI Registry of Educational Personnel to hold the student achievement/growth data and the evaluations for individual educators. Although the software necessary for validating the credit-based value added model is available to the PARE unit of OEAA, new routines for implementing the model on a large scale within the existing OEAA data systems will be required.

- Implementation of the plan:
  - What actions will the state take to implement the plan? The actions are listed above.
  - How frequently will the information be collected or publicly reported? Annually.
  - Which state agency or agencies will be responsible for:
    - Implementing the plan? MDE and CEPI
    - Monitoring the implementation of the plan? MDE and CEPI
    - Other oversight?

What evidence is there that these agency or agencies have the capacity to do this? An existing CEPI data system (the Registry of Educational Personnel) is already in place, and would serve as the basis for the additional reporting and data collection required under this indicator. The OEAA has already developed a student growth model that has been accepted by the USDOE and can be used in to feed into the teacher and principal evaluation system. Finally, OEAA has a significant Psychometrics, Accountability, Research & Evaluation (PARE) unit who collectively will be able to design, implement, and evaluate the achievement/growth components of the system.

- Will any additional institutional infrastructure be necessary to execute this (e.g., a new Web portal or another IT solution)? Yes. New fields will be required in the CEPI Registry of Educational Personnel to hold the student achievement/growth data and the evaluations for individual educators. Although the software necessary for validating the credit-based value added model is available to the PARE unit of OEAA, new routines for implementing the model on a large scale within the existing OEAA data systems will be required
- Are there any other obstacles that may prevent the state from developing or executing those means by September 30, 2011 (e.g., requirements and prohibitions of State law and policy)? Searchable reports of the data linking student growth to teachers requires at least two years.

Technical Assistance Requirements

Describe any technical assistance or support that the state will need for development and implementing the means to collect or publicly report the required information by using the following questions:

- What technical assistance or support is necessary for the development of the state plan? None is needed for this part of the plan.
- What agencies or organizations will be providing this technical assistance or support? None is needed for this part of the plan.
- What technical assistance or support is necessary for the implementation or oversight of the state plan? None is needed for this part of the plan.
    - Is any outreach or training required? LEAs will need training on using the growth reports for evaluation of teachers along with other performance measures.
- What agencies or organizations will be providing this technical assistance or support? The MDE will work with educational associations, teacher unions, administrators, and teacher preparation institutions to develop and provide training to local districts.

Public Reporting

Describe the public reporting around the development and implementation of the means to collect or publicly report the required information by using the following questions:

- How does the state intend to publicly report the plan? The Plan will be reported on the MDE website.
- How does the state intend to publicly report progress on the plan? Progress on the plan will be reported on the MDE website.
    - What is the nature of the progress reporting? A report on the districts that responded to the survey and those that did not will be reported along with a summary of total number of district responses to the survey items. In addition, progress on the development of the credit-based value added model will be provided to the State Board of Education.
    - How frequently will progress be reported? Progress will be reported quarterly until 100% of districts have responded to the survey, and until the system is in place for annual reporting.

- Identify the website where the plan and progress reports will be made publicly available. http://www.michigan.gov/mde/0,1607,7-140-6530_30334_51051-228482--,00.html

Budget

Create a budget for the development and implementation, and oversight. Indicate whether funds will be federal, state, local, or a combination.

Task	Budget Amount	Federal/State/Local
Development	$200,000.00	Federal/State
Implementation	$60,000.00	Federal/State
Oversight (field review oversight)	$50,000.00	Federal/State

Timeline

Use the chart below to describe key tasks and milestones that the state will use to measure progress and the estimated completion date of each task.

Key Tasks and Milestones	Estimated Completion Date
Use USED-approved assessment system to provide measures of student achievement in subjects tested by MDE.	Already in place
Use local assessments to provide measures of student proficiency in subjects not tested by MDE.	Fall 2011
Use the USED-Approved growth model to provide measures of student growth in subjects tested annually by MDE.	Already in place
Use pre-post achievement measures based on local interim/benchmark assessments for all subjects.	Fall 2011
Develop and implement a credit-based accountability system.	Fall 2011
Availability of searchable reports	Summer 2013

Indicator (a)(7): Provide, for each LEA in the State whose principals receive performance ratings or levels through an evaluation system, the number and percentage (including numerator and denominator) of principals rated at each performance rating or level.

Plan Element Verification

Element	Collection (check if applies)	Public Reporting (check if applies)
Indicator (a)(7)	X	X

Process for Development/Implementation

Describe the process that the State will use for developing and implementing means to collect or publicly report the required information as soon as possible but no later than September 30, 2011 by using the following questions.

- Development of the plan:
  - What actions will the state take to develop the plan? The MDE will conduct a survey of teacher performance ratings at the end of the 2009-10 school-year. Each LEA will be asked to provide the total number of teachers and principals evaluated and the number and percentage of teachers and principals rated in each of the following categories:
    - Ineffective/Unsatisfactory
    - Moderately Effective/Somewhat Satisfactory
    - Effective/Satisfactory
    - Highly Effective

The survey will be conducted during May and June 2010 with the possibility of being extended to July for LEAs that fail to report by June 30, 2010.

The definitions of the effectiveness ratings are those provided in the 2009 Race to the Top Application (CFDA Number 84.395A). These categories are in alignment with the reporting requirements of SFSF and RTTT. LEAs will be required to report the number and percentage of teachers and principals reported in each category in accordance with Indicators (a)(4) and (a)(7). The MDE works with the Center for Educational Performance and Information (CEPI) to collect data on principals, administrators, and other school personnel via the Registry of Educational Personnel (REP). The REP data is collected twice annually (in December and June). In addition, CEPI will add the necessary fields to gather the performance rating categories/levels used by LEAs. MDE will be providing guidance to LEAs regarding the various components that may be included in teacher and principal evaluation in addition to student growth data. MDE's Office of Professional Preparation Services (OPPS) is in the process of working with various stakeholders to develop and implement an observational rubric for the performance assessment of teachers based on the Professional Standards for Michigan Teachers (PSMT) and the Profile of Teacher Knowledge and Skills (PTKS) http://www.michigan.gov/documents/mde/SBE_approved_PSMT_May_13_2008+coverpg_258601_7.doc. A similar performance assessment will be developed for principals using the Standards for Principal Preparation (http://www.michigan.gov/documents/SBE_Item_Stds_for_Prep_of_School_Principals_Feb_04_86551_7.doc). In addition to the student growth data and the observation performance assessments, LEAs may choose other assessment tools to use as a part of the overall multi-faceted teacher and principal evaluation systems.

CEPI works with the Department of Information Technology (DIT) to develop and design the data reporting systems and public access to such data. CEPI also works with DIT to import the information on professional school personnel licenses from the License 2000 (L2K) educator licensure database into the REP. The coordination between the two databases provides a mechanism for monitoring to ensure that teachers are being assigned to teach in the areas in which they are endorsed or credentialed. MDE will work with CEPI to add the necessary fields on evaluation to the REP data collection. All teachers in Michigan are certificated and appropriately placed in classrooms, regardless of their preparation route. MDE currently has a contract with an outside vendor to complete the rewrite of its L2K educator licensure database. Enhancements to this database will include cross system alignment with the REP so that a common personal identification code (PIC) can be used to track teacher performance based on student achievement data back to the recommending teacher preparation institution.

CEPI compiles the reports that will be shared with the general public on the MDE's website. The teacher and principal effectiveness data, which is linked to student growth will also be shared with other offices in MDE that design and deliver professional development for teachers and principals. It is expected that CEPI will add the new fields to the REP in time for the June 2013 end of year data collection.

MDE and CEPI will work to implement the two major data collection and reporting requirements related to reporting growth of student achievement by school and teacher and using the growth data as part of the evaluations of principals and teachers. CEPI plans to start development of data definitions and to modify its data collection applications as soon as possible. The timelines are based on using feeder codes to report student growth data by teacher based on the links between students and teachers during the school year prior to the initial reporting. The reason for this requirement is that Michigan's student assessments are administered in the fall and reflect learning during the previous school year.

MDE will develop and implement training to LEAs on how to conduct multi-faceted teacher and principal evaluations and reporting requirements.
CEPI would begin collecting the teacher/student links in the fall 2011 Michigan Student Data System (MSDS) collection. Since these links represent teacher/student relationships in the 2011–12 school year, the first student growth reports would be available in winter 2013 based on comparing student achievement in fall 2013 with achievement in the fall of 2012. The student growth data must be based on two years of data in order o assess the effectiveness of teachers and principals. The advantages to this collection schedule are:

- It provides more lead time for districts and vendors between the release of data specifications and the initial collection of teacher/student links.
- Collecting teacher/student links at the beginning of the school year coincides with assignment of students to teachers at the beginning of the year.
- Districts typically have staff available during the fall to comply with the reporting requirements.
    - Which state agency or agencies will be responsible for the development of the plan? The Michigan Department of Education's Office of Professional Preparation Services (OPPS), and the Office of Educational Assessment and Accountability (OEAA) will work with the Center for Educational Performance and Information (CEPI) to publicly report the teacher evaluation data.
    - What evidence is there that the agency or agencies have the capacity to do this? OPPS works with CEPI to collect the Registry of Educational Personnel, which is done twice a year. CEPI is the recognized data collection and reporting agency for the state of Michigan. OEAA is responsible for conducting the annual Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP)

for elementary and middle school students and the Michigan Merit Examination (MME) for high school students. The OEAA has developed a student growth model that has been accepted by the USDOE and can be used in the teacher and principal evaluation system.

    - Will any additional institutional infrastructure be necessary to develop this (e.g., a new Web portal or another IT solution)? At this point no additional institutional infrastructure will be necessary.

- Implementation of the plan:
    - What actions will the state take to implement the plan? See timeline.
    - How frequently will the information be collected or publicly reported? Annually.
    - Which state agency or agencies will be responsible for:
        - Implementing the plan? MDE
        - Monitoring the implementation of the plan? MDE
        - Other oversight?

          What evidence is there that these agency or agencies have the capacity to do this? The MDE's OPPS, OEAA, and CEPI will work collaboratively to provide the oversight for this part of the plan.
    - Will any additional institutional infrastructure be necessary to execute this (e.g., a new Web portal or another IT solution)? No, not at this time.
    - Are there any other obstacles that may prevent the state from developing or executing those means by September 30, 2011 (e.g., requirements and prohibitions of state law and policy)? Searchable reports of the data linking student growth to teachers requires at least two years. The first report will not be available until 2013 (see timeline below)

Technical Assistance Requirements

Describe any technical assistance or support that the state will need for development and implementing the means to collect or publicly report the required information by using the following questions:

- What technical assistance or support is necessary for the development of the state plan? None is needed for this part of the plan.
- What agencies or organizations will be providing this technical assistance or support? None is needed for this part of the plan.
- What technical assistance or support is necessary for the implementation or oversight of the state plan? None is needed for this part of the plan.
    - Is any outreach or training required? LEAs will need training on using the growth reports for evaluation of teachers, principals, and administrators along with other performance measures.
- What agencies or organizations will be providing this technical assistance or support? The MDE will work with educational associations, teacher unions, administrators, and teacher preparation institutions to develop and provide training to local districts.

Public Reporting

Describe the public reporting around the development and implementation of the means to collect or publicly report the required information by using the following questions:

- How does the state intend to publicly report the plan? The Plan will be reported on the MDE website.

- How does the state intend to publicly report progress on the plan? Progress on the plan will be reported on the MDE website.
    - What is the nature of the progress reporting? A report on the districts that responded to the survey and those that did not will be reported along with a summary of total number of district responses to the survey items.
    - How frequently will progress be reported? Progress will be reported quarterly until 100% of districts have responded to the survey.
- Identify the website where the plan and progress reports will be made publicly available. http://www.michigan.gov/mde/0,1607,7-140-6530_30334_51051-228482--,00.html

Budget

Create a budget for the development and implementation, and oversight. Indicate whether funds will be federal, state, local, or a combination.

Task	Budget Amount	Federal/State/Local
Development	$200,000.00	Federal/State
Implementation	$60,000.00	Federal/State
Oversight (field review oversight)	$50,000.00	Federal/State

Timeline

Use the chart below to describe key tasks and milestones that the state will use to measure progress and the estimated completion date of each task.

Key Tasks and Milestone	Estimated Completion Date
Develop data definitions for Michigan Student Data System (MSDS) and Registry of Educational Personnel (REP)	Winter 2010
• MSDS to gather links from student to teacher and subject	N/A
• REP to gather effectiveness ratings of teachers and principals	N/A
Report Student Achievement Growth by School 2008–09	Winter 2010
MSDS used to assign 2008–09 feeder codes and full academic year status.	Winter 2010
Initial reports on principal evaluations.	Winter 2010
Reports of Student Achievement Growth by School (fall 2008 to fall 2009) based on feeder codes for full academic year students.	Spring 2010
Deadline for LEAs to respond to survey on teacher and principal evaluation categories.	Summer 2010
Create preliminary school effectiveness measures based on achievement and growth.	Summer 2010
Initial collection of principal evaluations.	Fall 2010
Requirements gathering for reports on principal evaluations	Fall 2010
Modify and test MSDS to add student/teacher and subject links	Spring 2011
Create final school effectiveness measures based on achievement and growth.	Summer 2011
LEAs use school effectiveness measures to inform principal evaluations.	Summer 2011
Initial collection of student/teacher links and subjects in MSDS	Fall 2011

• Students take assessments	Fall 2011
• MSDS used to assign 2010-11 feeder codes and full academic year status.	Fall 2012
• Reports of student achievement growth by teacher (fall 2009 to fall 2010) based on student/teacher links for 2009–10 school year. Reports based on feeder codes for full academic year students.	Winter 2012
Notify LEAs and vendors of new data collection requirements.	Winter 2011
Modify REP to collect evaluation labels for principals.	Winter 2011
Create preliminary teacher effectiveness measures based on achievement and growth.	Winter 2012
Modify REP to collect evaluation labels for teachers.	Summer 2012
Create final teacher effectiveness measures based on achievement and growth.	Spring 2012
LEAs use effectiveness measures to inform teacher evaluations.	Spring 2012
Initial collection of teacher evaluations.	Fall 2012
Requirements gathering for reports on teacher evaluations.	Fall 2012
Initial reports on teacher evaluations.	Winter 2013
Searchable reports on teacher and principal evaluations available through portal.	Summer 2013
LEAs use school effectiveness measures to inform principal promotion, tenure, hiring, compensation and retention decisions.	Spring 2014
LEAs use teacher effectiveness measures to inform teacher promotion, tenure, hiring, compensation and retention decisions.	Spring 2015

The data gathered by CEPI will be used to produce additional public reports on student growth, teacher and principal evaluation systems as required for both the SFSF and RTTT grants.

Indicator (c)(4): Indicate whether the State has completed, within the last two years, an analysis of the appropriateness and effectiveness of the accommodations it provides students with disabilities to ensure their meaningful participation in State assessments.

Plan Element Verification

Element	Collection (check if applies)	Public Reporting (check if applies)
Indicator (c)(4)		X

Process for Development/Implementation

Describe the process that the state will use for developing and implementing means to collect or publicly report the required information as soon as possible but no later than September 30, 2011, by using the following questions.

- Development of the plan:
  - What actions will the state take to develop the plan? The types of analyses described in this indicator are found in the technical reports developed annually for each state assessment. Currently, the technical reports found at the Web pages included with this section are made available to the public anywhere from 10 months to a year following each administration cycle. This is due to the nature of the information being compiled for the technical report, much of which is not available until all scoring activities have been completed. Michigan is taking significant strides to improve the timeliness of this information. For example, the state anticipated having the results of its fall assessments available to schools before December 20th for the first time ever. This improvement in scoring and reporting makes it possible to complete each assessment program’s technical report much sooner and post this information to the public Web pages. Michigan’s plan to keep this information up-to-date includes the following: (1) requiring each assessment contractor to work with the SEA to develop a detailed project schedule and milestone calendar specifically for each assessment program’s Technical Report, (2) requiring each assessment contractor to make a draft of the Technical Report available for SEA review within five months of assessment administration, (3) requiring SEA staff to work with the contractor to resolve all issues with the draft Technical Report within 30 days, and (4) post the completed technical report to the public Web pages no later than six months following the administration of any statewide assessment.
  - Which state agency or agencies will be responsible for the development of the plan? The Michigan Department of Education’s Office of Educational Assessment & Accountability (OEAA) will be responsible for the development and implementation of the plan described above.
  - What evidence is there that the agency or agencies have the capacity to do this? The OEAA has developed and disseminated the technical reports for all assessments required under ESEA and state legislation since it was established in 2003. During the past 18 months, the OEAA has developed and expanded a Psychometrics and Research Unit that includes three new psychometricians. This significantly enhanced capacity will permit the OEAA to work with assessment vendors on project schedules that will yield the technical reports in the anticipated timeframe.
  - Will any additional institutional infrastructure be necessary to develop this (e.g., a new Web portal or another IT solution)? N/A

- Implementation of the plan:
    - What actions will the state take to implement the plan? The OEAA will contact all assessment vendors in February 2010 to begin the process of developing timelines amenable to the production of technical reports as described above. All OEAA project managers will be involved with these discussions to ensure that each program's technical report is produced on a similar schedule.
    - How frequently will the information be collected or publicly reported? The technical reports will be compiled and provided to the public on the OEAA Web pages as soon as possible following each administration cycle.
    - Which state agency or agencies will be responsible for:
        - Implementing the plan? The OEAA will be responsible for the development of the plan described above.
        - Monitoring the implementation of the plan? The OEAA will be responsible for the monitoring and implementation of the plan described above.
    - Other oversight?

      What evidence is there that these agency or agencies have the capacity to do this? The OEAA has developed and disseminated the technical reports for all assessments required under ESEA and state legislation since it was established in 2003. During the past 18 months, the OEAA has developed and expanded a Psychometrics and Research Unit that includes three new psychometricians. This significantly enhanced capacity will permit the OEAA to work with assessment vendors on project schedules that will yield the technical reports in the anticipated timeframe.
    - Will any additional institutional infrastructure be necessary to execute this (e.g., a new Web portal or another IT solution)? N/A

Are there any other obstacles that may prevent the state from developing or executing those means by September 30, 2011 (e.g., requirements and prohibitions of state law and policy)? There are no additional obstacles that would prevent the state from developing or executing the plan described above by September 30, 2011.

Technical Assistance Requirements

Describe any technical assistance or support that the state will need for development and implementing the means to collect or publicly report the required information by using the following questions:

- What technical assistance or support is necessary for the development of the state plan? The state will not require additional support or technical assistance to develop and execute this plan.
- What agencies or organizations will be providing this technical assistance or support? The OEAA will work with all of its assessment vendors to develop and gather the technical requirements that will facilitate executing the plan described above.
- What technical assistance or support is necessary for the implementation or oversight of the state plan? The state will not require additional support or technical assistance to develop and execute this plan.
    - Is any outreach or training required? N/A
- What agencies or organizations will be providing this technical assistance or support? N/A

Public Reporting

Describe the public reporting around the development and implementation of the means to collect or publicly report the required information by using the following questions:

- How does the state intend to publicly report the plan? The technical reports will be compiled and provided to the public on the OEAA Web pages as soon as possible following each administration cycle.
- How does the state intend to publicly report progress on the plan? Not needed, this is a matter of expediting an existing task within our project schedule.
  - What is the nature of the progress reporting? N/A
  - How frequently will progress be reported? N/A
- Identify the website where the plan and progress reports will be made publicly available. www.michigan.gov/oeaa

Budget

Create a budget for the development and implementation, and oversight. Indicate whether funds will be federal, state, local, or a combination.

Task	Budget Amount	Federal/State/Local
Development (describe task or tasks if applicable) Face-to-face meetings with all assessment vendors to develop detailed project schedules	$25,000	Federal
Implementation (describe task or tasks if applicable) Implementing project schedules, revising as necessary, and reallocating staff resources to ensure goal is met	$25,000	Federal
Oversight (describe task or tasks if applicable) OEAA staff time dedicated to project schedule review and oversight of vendor deliverables that pertain to meeting this goal	$25,000	Federal

Timeline

Use the chart below to describe key tasks and milestones that the state will use to measure progress and the estimated completion date of each task.

Key Tasks and Milestones	Estimated Completion Date
Develop detailed project schedules with assessment vendors	April 2010
Apply project schedule to fall 2010 assessments	December 2010
Revise project schedules and apply resources as necessary to improve technical report development and dissemination	February 2011
Apply revised project schedule to spring 2011 assessments	June 2011
Revise project schedules and apply resources as necessary to improve technical report development and dissemination	August 2011
Apply revised project schedule to fall 2011 assessments that ensure public dissemination of technical report within six months of test administration window	September 2011

Indicator (c)(6): Indicate whether the State has completed, within the last two years, an analysis of the appropriateness and effectiveness of the accommodations it provides limited English proficient students to ensure their meaningful participation in State assessments.

Plan Element Verification

Element	Collection (check if applies)	Public Reporting (check if applies)
Indicator (c)(6)		X

Process for Development/Implementation

Describe the process that the state will use for developing and implementing means to collect or publicly report the required information as soon as possible but no later than September 30, 2011, by using the following questions.

- Development of the plan:
  - What actions will the state take to develop the plan? The types of analyses described in this indicator are found in the technical reports developed annually for each state assessment. Currently, the technical reports found at the Web pages included with this section are made available to the public anywhere from 10 months to a year following each administration cycle. This is due to the nature of the information being compiled for the technical report, much of which is not available until all scoring activities have been completed. Michigan is taking significant strides to improve the timeliness of this information. For example, the state anticipated having the results of its fall assessments available to schools before December 20th for the first time ever. This improvement in scoring and reporting makes it possible to complete each assessment program's technical report much sooner and post this information to the public Web pages. Michigan's plan to keep this information up-to-date includes the following: (1) requiring each assessment contractor to work with the SEA to develop a detailed project schedule and milestone calendar specifically for each assessment program's Technical Report, (2) requiring each assessment contractor to make a draft of the Technical Report available for SEA review within five months of assessment administration, (3) requiring SEA staff to work with the contractor to resolve all issues with the draft Technical Report within 30 days, and (4) Post the completed technical report to the public Web pages no later than six months following the administration of any statewide assessment.
  - Which state agency or agencies will be responsible for the development of the plan? The Michigan Department of Education's Office of Educational Assessment & Accountability (OEAA) will be responsible for the development and implementation of the plan described above.
  - What evidence is there that the agency or agencies have the capacity to do this? The OEAA has developed and disseminated the technical reports for all assessments required under ESEA and state legislation since it was established in 2003. During the past 18 months, the OEAA has developed and expanded a Psychometrics and Research Unit that includes three new psychometricians. This significantly enhanced capacity will permit the OEAA to work with assessment vendors on project schedules that will yield the technical reports in the anticipated timeframe.
  - Will any additional institutional infrastructure be necessary to develop this (e.g., a new Web portal or another IT solution)? N/A

- Implementation of the plan:
  - What actions will the state take to implement the plan? The OEAA will contact all assessment vendors in February 2010 to begin the process of developing timelines amenable to the production of technical reports as described above. All OEAA project managers will be involved with these discussions to ensure that each program's technical report is produced on a similar schedule.
  - How frequently will the information be collected or publicly reported? The technical reports will be compiled and provided to the public on the OEAA Web pages as soon as possible following each administration cycle.
  - Which state agency or agencies will be responsible for:
    - Implementing the plan? The OEAA will be responsible for the development of the plan described above.
    - Monitoring the implementation of the plan? The OEAA will be responsible for the monitoring and implementation of the plan described above.
  - Other oversight?

    What evidence is there that these agency or agencies have the capacity to do this? The OEAA has developed and disseminated the technical reports for all assessments required under ESEA and state legislation since it was established in 2003. During the past 18 months, the OEAA has developed and expanded a Psychometrics and Research Unit that includes three new psychometricians. This significantly enhanced capacity will permit the OEAA to work with assessment vendors on project schedules that will yield the technical reports in the anticipated timeframe.
  - Will any additional institutional infrastructure be necessary to execute this (e.g., a new Web portal or another IT solution)? N/A

Are there any other obstacles that may prevent the state from developing or executing those means by September 30, 2011 (e.g., requirements and prohibitions of state law and policy)? There are no additional obstacles that would prevent the state from developing or executing the plan described above by September 30, 2011.

Technical Assistance Requirements

Describe any technical assistance or support that the state will need for development and implementing the means to collect or publicly report the required information by using the following questions:

- What technical assistance or support is necessary for the development of the state plan? The state will not require additional support or technical assistance to develop and execute this plan.
- What agencies or organizations will be providing this technical assistance or support? The OEAA will work with all of its assessment vendors to develop and gather the technical requirements that will facilitate executing the plan described above.
- What technical assistance or support is necessary for the implementation or oversight of the state plan? The state will not require additional support or technical assistance to develop and execute this plan
  - Is any outreach or training required? N/A
- What agencies or organizations will be providing this technical assistance or support? N/A

Public Reporting

Describe the public reporting around the development and implementation of the means to collect or publicly report the required information by using the following questions:

- How does the state intend to publicly report the plan? The technical reports will be compiled and provided to the public on the OEAA Web pages as soon as possible following each administration cycle.
- How does the state intend to publicly report progress on the plan? Not needed, this is a matter of expediting an existing task within our project schedule.
    - What is the nature of the progress reporting? N/A
    - How frequently will progress be reported? N/A
- Identify the website where the plan and progress reports will be made publicly available. www.michigan.gov/oeaa

Budget

Create a budget for the development and implementation, and oversight. Indicate whether funds will be federal, state, local, or a combination.

Task	Budget Amount	Federal/State/Local
Development (describe task or tasks if applicable) Face-to-face meetings with all assessment vendors to develop detailed project schedules	$25,000	Federal
Implementation (describe task or tasks if applicable) Implementing project schedules, revising as necessary, and reallocating staff resources to ensure goal is met	$25,000	Federal
Oversight (describe task or tasks if applicable) OEAA staff time dedicated to project schedule review and oversight of vendor deliverables that pertain to meeting this goal	$25,000	Federal

Timeline

Use the chart below to describe key tasks and milestones that the state will use to measure progress and the estimated completion date of each task.

Key Tasks and Milestones	Estimated Completion Date
Develop detailed project schedules with assessment vendors	April 2010
Apply project schedule to fall 2010 assessments	December 2010
Revise project schedules and apply resources as necessary to improve technical report development and dissemination	February 2011
Apply revised project schedule to spring 2011 assessments	June 2011
Revise project schedules and apply resources as necessary to improve technical report development and dissemination	August 2011
Apply revised project schedule to fall 2011 assessments that ensure public dissemination of technical report within six months of test administration window	September 2011

Indicator (c)(7): Confirm whether the State provides native language versions of State assessments for limited English proficient students that are approved by the Department.

Plan Element Verification

Element	Collection (check if applies)	Public Reporting (check if applies)
Indicator (c)(7)		X

Process for Development/Implementation

Describe the process that the state will use for developing and implementing means to collect or publicly report the required information as soon as possible but no later than September 30, 2011, by using the following questions.

- Development of the plan:
  - What actions will the state take to develop the plan? The types of analyses described in this indicator are found in the technical reports developed annually for each state assessment. Currently, the technical reports found at the Web pages included with this section are made available to the public anywhere from eight months to a year following each administration cycle. This is due to the nature of the information being compiled for the technical report, much of which is not available until all scoring activities have been completed. Michigan is taking significant strides to improve the timeliness of this information. For example, the state anticipated having the results of its fall assessments available to schools before December 20th for the first time ever. This improvement in scoring and reporting makes it possible to complete each assessment program’s technical report much sooner and post this information to the public Web pages. Michigan’s plan to keep this information up-to-date includes the following: (1) requiring each assessment contractor to work with the SEA to develop a detailed project schedule and milestone calendar specifically for each assessment program’s Technical Report, (2) requiring each assessment contractor to make a draft of the Technical Report available for SEA review within five months of assessment administration, (3) requiring SEA staff to work with the contractor to resolve all issues with the draft Technical Report within 30 days, and (4) post the completed technical report to the public Web pages no later than six months following the administration of any statewide assessment.
  - Which state agency or agencies will be responsible for the development of the plan? The Michigan Department of Education’s Office of Educational Assessment & Accountability (OEAA) will be responsible for the development and implementation of the plan described above.
  - What evidence is there that the agency or agencies have the capacity to do this? The OEAA has developed and disseminated the technical reports for all assessments required under ESEA and state legislation since it was established in 2003. During the past 18 months, the OEAA has developed and expanded a Psychometrics and Research Unit that includes three new psychometricians. This significantly enhanced capacity will permit the OEAA to work with assessment vendors on project schedules that will yield the technical reports in the anticipated timeframe.
  - Will any additional institutional infrastructure be necessary to develop this (e.g., a new Web portal or another IT solution)? N/A
- Implementation of the plan:

- What actions will the state take to implement the plan? The OEAA will contact all assessment vendors in February 2010 to begin the process of developing timelines amenable to the production of technical reports as described above. All OEAA project managers will be involved with these discussions to ensure that each program's technical report is produced on a similar schedule.
- How frequently will the information be collected or publicly reported? The technical reports will be compiled and provided to the public on the OEAA Web pages as soon as possible following each administration cycle.
- Which state agency or agencies will be responsible for:
  - Implementing the plan? The OEAA will be responsible for the development of the plan described above.
  - Monitoring the implementation of the plan? The OEAA will be responsible for the monitoring and implementation of the plan described above.
- Other oversight?

  What evidence is there that these agency or agencies have the capacity to do this? The OEAA has developed and disseminated the technical reports for all assessments required under ESEA and state legislation since it was established in 2003. During the past 18 months, the OEAA has developed and expanded a Psychometrics and Research Unit that includes three new psychometricians. This significantly enhanced capacity will permit the OEAA to work with assessment vendors on project schedules that will yield the technical reports in the anticipated timeframe.
- Will any additional institutional infrastructure be necessary to execute this (e.g., a new Web portal or another IT solution)? N/A

Are there any other obstacles that may prevent the state from developing or executing those means by September 30, 2011 (e.g., requirements and prohibitions of state law and policy)? There are no additional obstacles that would prevent the state from developing or executing the plan described above by September 30, 2011.

Technical Assistance Requirements

Describe any technical assistance or support that the state will need for development and implementing the means to collect or publicly report the required information by using the following questions:

- What technical assistance or support is necessary for the development of the state plan? The state will not require additional support or technical assistance to develop and execute this plan.
- What agencies or organizations will be providing this technical assistance or support? N/A
- What technical assistance or support is necessary for the implementation or oversight of the state plan? N/A
  - Is any outreach or training required? N/A

Public Reporting

Describe the public reporting around the development and implementation of the means to collect or publicly report the required information by using the following questions:

- How does the state intend to publicly report the plan? The technical reports will be compiled and provided to the public on the OEAA Web pages as soon as possible following each administration cycle.
- How does the state intend to publicly report progress on the plan? Not needed, this is a matter of expediting an existing task within our project schedule.

- What is the nature of the progress reporting? N/A
- How frequently will progress be reported? N/A

- Identify the website where the plan and progress reports will be made publicly available. www.michigan.gov/oeaa

Budget

Create a budget for the development and implementation, and oversight. Indicate whether funds will be federal, state, local, or a combination.

Task	Budget Amount	Federal/State/Local
Development (describe task or tasks if applicable) Face-to-face meetings with all assessment vendors to develop detailed project schedules	$25,000	Federal
Implementation (describe task or tasks if applicable) Implementing project schedules, revising as necessary, and reallocating staff resources to ensure goal is met	$25,000	Federal
Oversight (describe task or tasks if applicable) OEAA staff time dedicated to project schedule review and oversight of vendor deliverables that pertain to meeting this goal	$25,000	Federal

Timeline

Use the chart below to describe key tasks and milestones that the state will use to measure progress and the estimated completion date of each task.

Key Tasks and Milestones	Estimated Completion Date
Develop detailed project schedules with assessment vendors	April 2010
Apply project schedule to fall 2010 assessments	December 2010
Revise project schedules and apply resources as necessary to improve technical report development and dissemination	February 2011
Apply revised project schedule to spring 2011 assessments	June 2011
Revise project schedules and apply resources as necessary to improve technical report development and dissemination	August 2011
Apply revised project schedule to fall 2011 assessments that ensure public dissemination of technical report within six months of test administration window	September 2011

Indicator (c)(8): Confirm the number and percentage (including numerator and denominator) of limited English proficient students who are included in State reading/language arts and mathematics assessments.

Plan Element Verification

Element	Collection (check if applies)	Public Reporting (check if applies)
Indicator (c)(8)		X

Process for Development/Implementation

Describe the process that the state will use for developing and implementing means to collect or publicly report the required information as soon as possible but no later than September 30, 2011, by using the following questions.

- Development of the plan:
  - What actions will the state take to develop the plan? Following each assessment cycle beginning in fall 2011, Michigan will produce aggregate reports showing the participation rates of Limited English Proficient (LEP) students and Students with Disabilities (SWD) and make them available to the public. Currently, Michigan's aggregate reports display this information for these student populations but do so separately for the general and alternate assessments. The new reports will provide participation rate data that show the combined participation rates for LEP and SWD across all statewide assessments. These reports will be available online and posted to the Office of Educational Assessment & Accountability's home page in .pdf format. They will be available to the public and posted at the same time as other state aggregate reports are released.
  - Which state agency or agencies will be responsible for the development of the plan? The Michigan Department of Education's Office of Educational Assessment & Accountability (OEAA) will be responsible for the development and implementation of the plan described above.
  - What evidence is there that the agency or agencies have the capacity to do this? The OEAA has developed and disseminated the assessment reports for all assessments required under ESEA and state legislation since it was established in 2003. As noted in the plan described above, the OEAA currently produces a variety of aggregate reports following each assessment cycle. OEAA staff are well versed in the requirements and resources needed to develop additional aggregate reports and ensure they are produced at the same time.
  - Will any additional institutional infrastructure be necessary to develop this (e.g., a new Web portal or another IT solution)? There will be minor modifications to the OEAA Secure Site and scope changes to the Administration and Reporting assessment contracts required to ensure these new reports are implemented by September 30, 2011.
- Implementation of the plan:
  - What actions will the state take to implement the plan? The OEAA will work with assessment vendors and other MDE IT specialists to gather the requirements and identify the reporting mechanisms necessary to implement these new aggregate reports. The OEAA will consult with stakeholders and its Technical Advisory Committee to ensure that the new reports contain data that are useful to educators.

- How frequently will the information be collected or publicly reported? The new reports will be developed and provided to educators and the public as soon as possible following each administration cycle. The new reports will be released at the same time as all other state assessment reports are made available.
- Which state agency or agencies will be responsible for:
  - Implementing the plan? The OEAA will be responsible for the development of the plan described above.
  - Monitoring the implementation of the plan? The OEAA will be responsible for the monitoring and implementation of the plan described above.
- Other oversight? N/A

  What evidence is there that these agency or agencies have the capacity to do this? The OEAA has developed and disseminated the assessment reports for all assessments required under ESEA and state legislation since it was established in 2003. As noted in the plan described above, the OEAA currently produces a variety of aggregate reports following each assessment cycle. OEAA staff are well versed in the requirements and resources needed to develop additional aggregate reports, and ensure they are produced at the same time.
- Will any additional institutional infrastructure be necessary to execute this (e.g., a new Web portal or another IT solution)? There will be minor modifications to the OEAA Secure Site and scope changes to the Administration and Reporting assessment contracts required to ensure these new reports are implemented by September 30, 2011.

Are there any other obstacles that may prevent the state from developing or executing those means by September 30, 2011 (e.g., requirements and prohibitions of state law and policy)? There are no additional obstacles that would prevent the state from developing or executing the plan described above by September 30, 2011.

Technical Assistance Requirements

Describe any technical assistance or support that the state will need for development and implementing the means to collect or publicly report the required information by using the following questions:

- What technical assistance or support is necessary for the development of the state plan? The Michigan Department of Information Technology (MDIT) is responsible for managing all IT contracts for the state of Michigan, and the DIT Project Management Office (PMO) has developed and implemented the DIT Project Management Methodology (PMM) to provide the necessary management controls and tools. The PMM includes the following phases: Initiation, Planning, Execution, Closeout, and Control. Control operates throughout all phases. DIT senior project managers have many years of experience and are able to manage large contracts and apply the PMM methodology and controls. The nine “knowledge areas” that the senior project managers are expected to manage during the course of the project are integration, scope, time, cost, quality, human resources, communications, risk, and procurement.
- What agencies or organizations will be providing this technical assistance or support? MDIT.
- What technical assistance or support is necessary for the implementation or oversight of the state plan? Project management, longitudinal database administration, metadata management, and documentation.
  - Is any outreach or training required? Throughout the process, from requirements gathering to implementation, training plans will be developed for each new report or system functionality. Contracted training resources will be used to develop training materials and a train-the-trainer method often used by the state. Using ISD resources as conduits of information about data aspects to the local level has proven successful in past projects, and we anticipate using professional education associations, ISDs, and LEAs in the same manner to disseminate

training to postsecondary institutions. A particular focus of the training around this project will be in the use of the data to improve instruction, identify leaks in the education pipeline, and provide some indicators of postsecondary student success. Several methods of training media have been used in the past and will continue to be used, from narrated report walk-through video clips, context-sensitive help in applications, and detailed manuals to face-to-face training sessions and online webinars that are coordinated with our external partners.

- What agencies or organizations will be providing this technical assistance or support? MDIT, vendor teams, school district partners, state educator association organizations.

Public Reporting

Describe the public reporting around the development and implementation of the means to collect or publicly report the required information by using the following questions:

- How does the state intend to publicly report the plan? The new reports will be developed and provided to educators and the public as soon as possible following each administration cycle. The new reports will be released at the same time as all other state assessment reports are made available.
- How does the state intend to publicly report progress on the plan? Not needed, this is a matter of expanding our existing complement of reports.
    - What is the nature of the progress reporting? N/A
    - How frequently will progress be reported? N/A
- Identify the website where the plan and progress reports will be made publicly available. When the reports have been created, the OEAA will post an announcement on its Web page (www.michigan.gov/oeaa) and provide instructions on how they can be accessed via the OEAA Secure site (https://oeaa.state.mi.us/meap/login.asp). The announcement will be located under the red "OEAA Secure Site - Click Here" button. Detailed instructions will be provided to authorized users (LEA personnel) as they log onto the OEAA Secure Site. The 'Announcements' section of the Secure Site will contain the instructions.

Budget

Create a budget for the development and implementation, and oversight. Indicate whether funds will be federal, state, local, or a combination.

Task	Budget Amount	Federal/State/Local
Development (describe task or tasks if applicable) Face-to-face meetings with all assessment vendors to develop detailed project schedules and determine changes to the scope of current administration contracts	$50,000	Federal
Implementation (describe task or tasks if applicable) Implementing project schedules, resolving scope changes to administration contracts, and reallocating staff resources to ensure goal is met	$50,000	Federal
Oversight (describe task or tasks if applicable) OEAA staff time dedicated to project schedule review and oversight of vendor deliverables that pertain to meeting this goal	$25,000	Federal

Timeline

Use the chart below to describe key tasks and milestones that the state will use to measure progress and the estimated completion date of each task.

Key Tasks and Milestones	Estimated Completion Date
Identify and document requirements for the new reports with all assessment vendors	April 2010
Apply new requirements in detailed project schedules with assessment vendors for all assessment programs	July 2010
Apply project schedules to fall 2010 assessments and identify areas of improvement for future cycles. Attempt to produce these reports for the first time and determine true ramifications on project schedules	December 2010
Revise project schedules and reallocate resources as necessary to improve aggregate report development and dissemination	February 2011
Apply revised project schedule to spring 2011 assessments	June 2011
Apply revised project schedule to fall 2011 assessments to ensure the new aggregate reports are fully developed and provided with all other reports	September 2011

Indicator (c)(11): Provide, for the State, for each LEA in the State, for each high school in the State and, at each of these levels, by student subgroup (consistent with section 1111(b)(2)(C)(v)(II) of the ESEA), of the students who graduate from high school consistent with 34 CFR 200.19(b)(1)(i), the number and percentage (including numerator and denominator) who enroll in an institution of higher education (IHE) (as defined in section 101(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended (HEA)) within 16 months of receiving a regular high school diploma.

Plan Element Verification

Element	Collection (check if applies)	Public Reporting (check if applies)
Indicator (c)(11)	X	X

Process for Development/Implementation

Describe the process that the state will use for developing and implementing means to collect or publicly report the required information as soon as possible but no later than September 30, 2011, by using the following questions.

- Development of the plan:

  - What actions will the state take to develop the plan? Under the Statewide Longitudinal Data System grant (SLDS) 2009, Michigan has begun implementing a statewide electronic transcript system and already requires that the statewide unique student identifier be on each transcript sent to and among postsecondary institutions. In-state Postsecondary institutions will be required to submit transcripts of all currently enrolled students to the electronic transcript vendor at reasonable intervals throughout the school year. The electronic transcript vendor stores these transcripts in a data repository system in a parsed data format. Data will be extracted from the electronic transcript vendor's data repository and added to students' records in the SLDS.

    Michigan is working with the vendor to prototype several postsecondary reports, and on reports that will link postsecondary data to the K–12 data. Michigan plans to build upon the prototyping and pull selected elements of the postsecondary institution student information from the transcript repository directly into the SLDS, maintaining the information alongside a student's PK–12 data.

    Based on statewide requirements-gathering sessions and ARRA, Perkins, IDEA, and other federal reporting requirements, analyses and reports will be prepared and published to examine individual and aggregate student postsecondary transitions from PK–12. In addition, Michigan will prepare reports in compliance with SFSF that track the enrollment of high school graduates by subgroup into postsecondary institutions, detail the type and amount of remedial coursework required by students, and track exit and completion status of postsecondary students. Although institutions and the state exchange this information, strict adherence to FERPA regulations regarding individual student information will be observed.

To accommodate the need delineated by this indicator to track Michigan's high school graduates across state lines, Michigan will explore the use of vendor services that can be leveraged to more accurately gauge true college enrollment trends that include high school graduates who move outside of our border. We understand that there has been some success in other states in locating a fair percentage of students who have left a state's boundary to attend an institution of higher education in another state. In absence of a national student ID, and a state prohibition on collecting the social security numbers of students, more analysis will be needed to determine whether available services can provide the necessary key demographic match rates to make this a success. If services are found to be adequate for this purpose, Michigan will seek federal funding to support the mandate, or will ask the Michigan legislature to provide school aid funding to meet this purpose. The latter would take critically needed dollars out of the classroom in Michigan.

- Which state agency or agencies will be responsible for the development of the plan? The Center for Educational Performance and Information (CEPI) is statutorily authorized by the Michigan Legislature to coordinate the collection, management, and reporting of all data required by state and federal law from PK–12 educational entities and from public postsecondary institutions, and to implement a P–20 Longitudinal Data System.
- What evidence is there that the agency or agencies have the capacity to do this? Michigan already uses a state-issued unique identifier to connect and report (by subgroup) data from K–12 general education, special education, career and technical education, migrant education, early childhood, and assessment. Similar processes will be leveraged and enhanced to connect these data points to postsecondary data sources.
- Will any additional institutional infrastructure be necessary to develop this (e.g., a new Web portal or another IT solution)? Michigan's Data for Student Success (D4SS) collaborative project between the SEA, ISDs, and LEAs is the prototype for building Michigan's Web-based education data portal that will provide information to schools, leaders, teachers, researchers, and the public. Michigan's SLDS will supply additional data sets to the portal and expand dynamic inquiry capabilities to allow users to examine student progress and outcomes through preschool, postsecondary, and into the workforce. These enhanced tools will ensure more efficient query capability, reporting capacity, and ultimately will result in greater transparency for taxpayers.

- Implementation of the plan:
  - What actions will the state take to implement the plan? Michigan has demonstrated repeated success by strategically following an iterative process of requirements gathering, design, prototype development, testing, automating successful prototypes for full-scale production, and deployment coupled with training and professional development. Using funding from SLDS 2009, we already have on contract a professional requirements-gathering team. We will maximize this earlier investment and design deliverables that will utilize existing infrastructure, software, systems, and tools wherever possible. During the development process, a phased approach will allow development to begin on certain system components while deliverables in subsequent phases of the project can be designed.
  - How frequently will the information be collected or publicly reported? The transcript data will be collected and brought into the state education data system at least annually. Reporting will correspond with the collection cycle.
  - Which state agency or agencies will be responsible for:
    - Implementing the plan? CEPI
    - Monitoring the implementation of the plan? As with previous SLDS grant projects, the Michigan Department of Education (MDE) serves as the fiscal agent for the project, and CEPI is responsible for directing the project activities and subsequent operation of the

statewide system. The Michigan Department of Information Technology (MDIT) is responsible for managing all IT contract for the state, and the DIT Project Management Office has developed and implemented the DIT Project Management Methodology (PMM) to provide the necessary management controls and tools to ensure good direction and oversight.

- Other oversight?

  The P–20 Advisory Council will consist of representatives from the preschool, K–12, postsecondary, and other adult learner education communities, as well as the workforce and overall system support. The P–20 Advisory Council would be responsible for making policy recommendations to CEPI for full implementation of the P–20 system. Examples of systemic policymaking needs include model agreements or memorandums of understanding for storing unique student identifiers and matching student-level data in postsecondary data systems, the reporting of student-level remedial coursework from postsecondary institutions to high schools, the connection of individual teacher data to teacher preparation colleges, and student privacy policies. In addition, the council will work with the Research Collaborative to develop a state research agenda. Finally, the P–20 Advisory Council will serve as a body to resolve implementation issues escalated to it from either the PK–12 or the Adult Learner Data Work Groups. CEPI will coordinate the work of this group using existing SLDS 2009 grant resources.

  What evidence is there that these agency or agencies have the capacity to do this? Michigan has successfully implemented a collaborative project-oversight process to review the status of the projects, communicate successes, and manage issues related to each of the America Competes Act elements already addressed in the state.

- Will any additional institutional infrastructure be necessary to execute this (e.g., a new Web portal or another IT solution)? See above.

Are there any other obstacles that may prevent the state from developing or executing those means by September 30, 2011 (e.g., requirements and prohibitions of state law and policy)? None known at this time.

Technical Assistance Requirements

Describe any technical assistance or support that the state will need for development and implementing the means to collect or publicly report the required information by using the following questions:

- What technical assistance or support is necessary for the development of the state plan? The Michigan Department of Information Technology (MDIT) is responsible for managing all IT contracts for the state of Michigan, and the DIT Project Management Office (PMO) has developed and implemented the DIT Project Management Methodology (PMM) to provide the necessary management controls and tools. The PMM includes the following phases: Initiation, Planning, Execution, Closeout, and Control. Control operates throughout all phases. DIT senior project managers have many years of experience and are able to manage large contracts and apply the PMM methodology and controls. The nine "knowledge areas" that the senior project managers are expected to manage during the course of the project are integration, scope, time, cost, quality, human resources, communications, risk, and procurement.
- What agencies or organizations will be providing this technical assistance or support? MDIT.
- What technical assistance or support is necessary for the implementation or oversight of the state plan? Project management, longitudinal database administration, metadata management, and documentation.
  - Is any outreach or training required? Throughout the process, from requirements gathering to implementation, training plans will be developed for each new report or system functionality. Contracted training resources will be used to develop training materials and a train-the-trainer

method often used by the state. Using ISD resources as conduits of information about data aspects to the local level has proven successful in past projects, and we anticipate using postsecondary associations in the same manner to disseminate training to postsecondary institutions. A particular focus of the training around this project will be in the use of the data to improve instruction, identify leaks in the education pipeline, and provide some indicators of postsecondary student success. Several methods of training media have been used in the past and will continue to be used, from narrated report walk-through video clips, context-sensitive help in applications, and detailed manuals to face-to-face training sessions and online webinars that are coordinated with our external partners.

- What agencies or organizations will be providing this technical assistance or support? MDIT, vendor teams, school district partners.

Public Reporting

Describe the public reporting around the development and implementation of the means to collect or publicly report the required information by using the following questions:

- How does the state intend to publicly report the plan? For this item, the CEPI website will be used to provide public access. Once the education data portal is developed, that will become the access point for the public to view results.
- How does the state intend to publicly report progress on the plan? MDE website
  - What is the nature of the progress reporting? Updates
  - How frequently will progress be reported? Quarterly
- Identify the website where the plan and progress reports will be made publicly available. http://www.michigan.gov/mde/0,1607,7-140-6530_30334_51051-228482--,00.html

Budget

Create a budget for the development and implementation, and oversight. Indicate whether funds will be federal, state, local, or a combination.

Task	Budget Amount	Federal/State/Local
Development (describe task or tasks if applicable) Report Requirements Gathering Pull information from transcript repository Data analysis and report development Secure contract with a student record clearinghouse	 $100,000 $250,000 $250,000 $100,000	 Federal Federal Federal Federal
Implementation (describe task or tasks if applicable) payments to postsecondary institutions to implement process	$2,420,000	Federal
Oversight (describe task or tasks if applicable) P–20 Council	$64,000	Federal

Note: This budget represents separate funds from those identified in Indicator (c)(12).

Timeline

Use the chart below to describe key tasks and milestones that the state will use to measure progress and the estimated completion date of each task.

Key Tasks and Milestones	**Estimated Completion Date**
Explore alternatives	Summer 2010
Contract writing for data match services	Fall 2010
Implement process for colleges to push transcripts to e-transcript vendor on a regular schedule	Fall 2010
State pull of appropriate transcript information from e-transcript vendor transcript repository	Fall 2010
Assign unique identifiers to postsecondary students who don’t have them, and resolve duplicate matching issues	Winter 2010
Gather requirements for postsecondary reports related to compliance with SFSF	Summer 2010
Add matched records to the SLDS	Spring 2011
Design, test, and implement reports and analysis based on the linkage of PK–12 and postsecondary information	Summer 2011

Indicator (c)(12): Provide, for the State, for each LEA in the State, for each high school in the State and, at each of these levels, by student subgroup (consistent with section 1111(b)(2)(C)(v)(II) of the ESEA), of the students who graduate from high school consistent with 34 CFR 200.19(b)(1)(i) who enroll in a public IHE (as defined in section 101(a) of the HEA) in the State within 16 months of receiving a regular high school diploma, the number and percentage (including numerator and denominator) who complete at least one year's worth of college credit (applicable to a degree) within two years of enrollment in the IHE.

Plan Element Verification

Element	Collection (check if applies)	Public Reporting (check if applies)
Indicator (c)(12)	X	X

Process for Development/Implementation

Describe the process that the state will use for developing and implementing means to collect or publicly report the required information as soon as possible but no later than September 30, 2011, by using the following questions.

- Development of the plan:
  - What actions will the state take to develop the plan? Under SLDS 2009, Michigan has begun implementing a statewide electronic transcript system and already requires that the statewide unique student identifier be on each transcript sent to and among postsecondary institutions. Postsecondary institutions will be required to submit transcripts of all currently enrolled students to the electronic transcript vendor at reasonable intervals throughout the school year. The electronic transcript vendor stores these transcripts in a data repository system in a parsed data format. Data will be extracted from the electronic transcript vendor's data repository and added to students' records in the SLDS. Michigan is working with the vendor to prototype several postsecondary reports and reports linking postsecondary data to K–12 data.

    Michigan plans to build upon the prototyping and pull selected elements of the postsecondary institution student information from the transcript repository directly into the SLDS, maintaining the information alongside a student's PK–12 data. Based on statewide requirements-gathering sessions and ARRA, Perkins, IDEA, and other federal reporting requirements, analyses and reports will be prepared and published to examine individual and aggregate student postsecondary transitions from PK–12. In addition, Michigan will prepare reports in compliance with SFSF that track the enrollment of high school graduates by subgroup into postsecondary institutions, detail the type and amount of remedial coursework required by students, and track exit and completion status of postsecondary students. Although institutions and the state exchange this information, strict adherence to FERPA regulations regarding individual student information will be observed.
  - Which state agency or agencies will be responsible for the development of the plan? The Center for Educational Performance and Information (CEPI) is statutorily authorized by the Michigan Legislature to coordinate the collection, management, and reporting of all data required by state and federal law from PK–12 educational entities and from public postsecondary institutions, and to implement a P–20 Longitudinal Data System.
  - What evidence is there that the agency or agencies have the capacity to do this? Michigan already uses a state-issued unique identifier to connect and report (by subgroup) data from

K–12 general education, special education, career and technical education, migrant education, early childhood, and assessment. Similar processes will be leveraged and enhanced to connect these data points to postsecondary data sources.

  - Will any additional institutional infrastructure be necessary to develop this (e.g., a new Web portal or another IT solution)? Michigan's Data for Student Success (D4SS) collaborative project between the SEA, ISDs, and LEAs is the prototype for building Michigan's Web-based education data portal that will provide information to schools, leaders, teachers, researchers, and the public. Michigan's SLDS will supply additional data sets to the portal and expand dynamic inquiry capabilities to allow users to examine student progress and outcomes through preschool, postsecondary, and into the workforce. These enhanced tools will ensure more efficient query capability, reporting capacity, and ultimately will result in greater transparency for taxpayers.

- Implementation of the plan:

  - What actions will the state take to implement the plan? Michigan has demonstrated repeated success by strategically following an iterative process of requirements gathering, design, prototype development, testing, automating successful prototypes for full-scale production, and deployment coupled with training and professional development. Using funding from SLDS 2009, we already have on contract a professional requirements-gathering team. We will maximize this earlier investment and design deliverables that will utilize existing infrastructure, software, systems, and tools wherever possible. During the development process, a phased approach will allow development to begin on certain system components while deliverables in subsequent phases of the project can be designed.

  - How frequently will the information be collected or publicly reported? The transcript data will be collected and brought into the state education data system at least annually. Reporting will correspond with the collection cycle.

  - Which state agency or agencies will be responsible for:

    - Implementing the plan? CEPI

    - Monitoring the implementation of the plan? As with previous SLDS grant projects, the Michigan Department of Education (MDE) serves as the fiscal agent for the project, and CEPI is responsible for directing the project activities and subsequent operation of the statewide system. The Michigan Department of Information Technology (MDIT) is responsible for managing all IT contract for the state, and the DIT Project Management Office has developed and implemented the DIT Project Management Methodology (PMM) to provide the necessary management controls and tools to ensure good direction and oversight.

  - Other oversight?

    The P–20 Advisory Council will consist of representatives from the preschool, K–12, postsecondary, and other adult learner education communities, as well as the workforce and overall system support. The P–20 Advisory Council would be responsible for making policy recommendations to CEPI for full implementation of the P–20 system. Examples of systemic policymaking needs include model agreements or memorandums of understanding for storing unique student identifiers and matching student-level data in postsecondary data systems, the reporting of student-level remedial coursework from postsecondary institutions to high schools, the connection of individual teacher data to teacher preparation colleges, and student privacy policies. In addition, the council will work with the Research Collaborative to develop a state research agenda. Finally, the P–20 Advisory Council will serve as a body to resolve implementation issues escalated to it from either the PK–12 or the Adult Learner Data Work Groups. CEPI will coordinate the work of this group using existing SLDS 2009 grant resources.

    What evidence is there that these agency or agencies have the capacity to do this? Michigan has successfully implemented a collaborative project-oversight process to review the status of the projects, communicate successes, and manage issues related to each of the America Competes Act elements already addressed in the state.

- Will any additional institutional infrastructure be necessary to execute this (e.g., a new Web portal or another IT solution)? See above.

Are there any other obstacles that may prevent the state from developing or executing those means by September 30, 2011 (e.g., requirements and prohibitions of state law and policy)? None known at this time.

Technical Assistance Requirements

Describe any technical assistance or support that the state will need for development and implementing the means to collect or publicly report the required information by using the following questions:

- What technical assistance or support is necessary for the development of the state plan? The Michigan Department of Information Technology (MDIT) is responsible for managing all IT contracts for the state of Michigan, and the DIT Project Management Office (PMO) has developed and implemented the DIT Project Management Methodology (PMM) to provide the necessary management controls and tools. The PMM includes the following phases: Initiation, Planning, Execution, Closeout, and Control. Control operates throughout all phases. DIT senior project managers have many years of experience and are able to manage large contracts and apply the PMM methodology and controls. The nine “knowledge areas” that the senior project managers are expected to manage during the course of the project are integration, scope, time, cost, quality, human resources, communications, risk, and procurement.
- What agencies or organizations will be providing this technical assistance or support? MDIT.
- What technical assistance or support is necessary for the implementation or oversight of the state plan? Project management, longitudinal database administration, metadata management and documentation.
  - Is any outreach or training required? Throughout the process, from requirements gathering to implementation, training plans will be developed for each new report or system functionality. Contracted training resources will be used to develop training materials and a train-the-trainer method often used by the state. Using ISD resources as conduits of information about data aspects to the local level has proven successful in past projects, and we anticipate using postsecondary associations in the same manner to disseminate training to postsecondary institutions. A particular focus of the training around this project will be in the use of the data to improve instruction, identify leaks in the education pipeline, and provide some indicators of postsecondary student success. Several methods of training media have been used in the past and will continue to be used, from narrated report walk-through video clips, context-sensitive help in applications, and detailed manuals to face-to-face training sessions and online webinars that are coordinated with our external partners.
- What agencies or organizations will be providing this technical assistance or support? MDIT, vendor teams, school district partners.

Public Reporting

Describe the public reporting around the development and implementation of the means to collect or publicly report the required information by using the following questions:

- How does the state intend to publicly report the plan? For this item, the CEPI website will be used to provide public access. Once the education data portal is developed, that will become the access point for the public to view results.
- How does the state intend to publicly report progress on the plan? MDE website
  - What is the nature of the progress reporting? Updates

    - How frequently will progress be reported? Quarterly

- Identify the website where the plan and progress reports will be made publicly available. http://www.michigan.gov/mde/0,1607,7-140-6530_30334_51051-228482--,00.html

Budget

Create a budget for the development and implementation, and oversight. Indicate whether funds will be federal, state, local, or a combination.

Task	Budget Amount	Federal/State/Local
Development (describe task or tasks if applicable) Report requirements gathering Pull information from transcript repository Data analysis and report development	$100,000 $250,000 $250,000	Federal Federal Federal
Implementation (describe task or tasks if applicable) Payments to K–12 LEAs to implement process	$3,600,000	Federal
Oversight (describe task or tasks if applicable) P–20 Council	$64,000	Federal

Note: This budget represents separate funds from those identified in Indicator (c)(11).

Timeline

Use the chart below to describe key tasks and milestones that the state will use to measure progress and the estimated completion date of each task.

Key Tasks and Milestones	Estimated Completion Date
Implement process for colleges to push transcripts to e-transcript vendor on a regular schedule	Fall 2010
State pull of appropriate transcript information from e-transcript vendor transcript repository	Fall 2010
Assign unique identifiers to postsecondary students who don't have them, and resolve duplicate matching issues	Winter 2010
Gather requirements for postsecondary reports related to compliance with SFSF	Summer 2010
Design, test, and implement reports and analysis based on the linkage of PK–12 and postsecondary information	Summer 2011

Indicator (d)(1): Provide, for the State, the average statewide school gain in the "all students" category and the average statewide school gain for each student subgroup (as under section 1111(b)(2)(C)(v) of the ESEA) on the State assessments in reading/language arts and for the State and for each LEA in the State, the number and percentage (including numerator and denominator) of Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that have made progress (as defined in this notice) on State assessments in reading/language arts in the last year.

Indicator (d)(2): Provide, for the State, the average statewide school gain in the "all students" category and the average statewide school gain for each student subgroup (as under section 1111(b)(2)(C)(v) of the ESEA) on State assessments in mathematics and for the State and for each LEA in the State, the number and percentage (including numerator and denominator) of Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that have made progress on State assessments in mathematics in the last year.

Indicator (d)(9): Provide, for the State and for each LEA in the State that operates charter schools, the number and percentage of charter schools that have made progress on State assessments in reading/language arts in the last year.

Indicator (d)(10): Provide, for the State and for each LEA in the State that operates charter schools, the number and percentage of charter schools that have made progress on State assessments in mathematics in the last year.

Plan Element Verification

Element	Collection (check if applies)	Public Reporting (check if applies)
Indicator (d)(1)		X
Indicator (d)(2)		X
Indicator (d)(9)		X
Indicator (d)(10)		X

Process for Development/Implementation

Describe the process that the state will use for developing and implementing means to collect or publicly report the required information as soon as possible but no later than September 30, 2011.

- Michigan currently collects student performance level change data in mathematics and reading in Grades 4–8, and reports the data publicly at the whole-school level on a downloadable Microsoft Excel spreadsheet (see the "Fall 2008 MEAP School & District Progress Data" link at http://www.michigan.gov/mde/0,1607,7-140-22709_31168-213744--,00.html). Because in Microsoft Excel versions used by the state and most LEAs is limited in the number of rows that can be used in a spreadsheet, and because reporting progress data for each subgroup will dramatically increase the number of rows necessary, the state will need to develop database tables to reside online, and an online interface for searching for an individual Intermediate School District, District, or School, and specifying the group/subgroup for which the progress data is desired. Because the data already exist, the timelines are only for the development of the tables (for the fall 2010 test cycle to be downloadable by individual ISDs, districts, or schools) and the development of the online interface for searching for and publicly displaying data (for the fall 2011 test cycle). The data to be displayed include the following:

- For students at each starting point the previous year, what percentage of those students ended up at each ending point this year (e.g., from the low end of the "partially proficient" category to the middle of the "proficient" category).
- For all students, for students previously proficient, and for students not previously proficient the percentage of students in five performance level change (PLC, or "growth") categories as compared to the previous year as follows:
  1. Significant decline
  2. Decline
  3. Maintenance
  4. Improvement
  5. Significant improvement

- In this system, students showing maintenance display one year of growth for one year of instruction, students showing declines or significant declines exhibit less than one year of growth for one year of instruction, and students showing improvement or significant improvement exhibit more than one year of growth for one year of instruction.
- This reporting system will also display Title I status, and whether the school is in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring.
- This system is applicable only in grades and subjects where there was a test in the previous grade level and in the same subject. Therefore, because Michigan tests reading and mathematics in Grades 3–8 and high school, this is applicable only to reading and mathematics in Grades 4–8.
- For all high school tested subjects (mathematics, reading, writing, science, and social studies), for all Grade 3 tested subjects (reading and mathematics), and for all other tested subjects and grades (Grade 4 and 7 writing, Grade 5 and 8 science, and Grade 6 and 9 social studies), a different successive-cohort-based regression model will be used to identify schools with positive significant, nonsignificant, and negative significant trend in percent proficient changes over the previous three years. This will be done only where there are three years of comparable data for each grade and subject for which this methodology is applicable.
- For all other nontested subjects and grades, growth data will not be made available publicly. The data elements will be aggregated to the statewide level for the Struggling Schools Report to show statewide average gain in mathematics and reading for "all students" and for each subgroup. The report will include the number and percentage of Title I Schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that have made progress on state reading and mathematics assessments for each year. The Struggling Schools Report will be developed over the 2009–10 and 2010–11 school years.
- Michigan currently collects student performance level change data in mathematics and reading in Grades 4–8, and reports the data publicly at the whole-school level on a downloadable Microsoft Excel spreadsheet (see the "Fall 2008 MEAP School & District Progress Data" link at http://www.michigan.gov/mde/0,1607,7-140-22709_31168-213744--,00.html). However, the reporting mechanism does not specifically have a flag identifying schools as charter schools except by interpreting the name of the school to be a charter school. The plan developed for Indicator (d)(1) will also include a specific, searchable flag for charter schools.
- Although the performance level change addresses only Grades 3–8 in mathematics and reading, there are also other subject (e.g., writing, science, social studies) and grades (e.g., high school) where this model does not apply. In those grades and subjects, a noncohort change analysis (e.g., last year's cohort in Grade 8 science versus this year's cohort in Grade 8 science) can be

performed instead. By taking three years of data, a regression analysis can be performed to identify the slope of the average increase in percent proficient over three years. These data will be provided for the other grades and subjects as a proxy for student gains.

- The Michigan Department of Education is responsible for collection and display of all data. Two offices within MDE will be responsible for development and deployment of the data—Office of Educational Assessment and Accountability (OEAA) and Office of Education Improvement and Innovation (OEII).
- The student growth and school gains data will be published annually. The first elements to be reported for the 2009–10 school year will be: average gains in reading and mathematics, schools making progress, persistently lowest-achieving schools, and reasons for charter school closure. All required elements will be included by August 2011.

Technical Assistance Requirements

Describe any technical assistance or support that the state will need for development and implementing the means to collect or publicly report the required information.

No technical assistance needed.

Public Reporting

Describe the public reporting around the development and implementation of the means to collect or publicly report the required information.

See above. Progress reports will be posted on the MDE website for progress reporting.
http://www.michigan.gov/mde/0,1607,7-140-6530_30334_51051-228482--,00.html

Budget

Create a budget for the development and implementation, and oversight. Indicate whether funds will be federal, state, local, or a combination.

Task	Budget Amount	Federal/State/Local
Development	$16,000	Federal
Implementation	$8,000	Federal
Oversight	$5,000	Federal

Timeline

Use the chart below to describe key tasks and milestones that the state will use to measure progress and the estimated completion date of each task.

Key Tasks and Milestones	Estimated Completion Date
Growth modeling for elementary and middle schools statewide	April 30, 2010
Comparison of elementary and middle schools to statewide progress	April 30, 2010
Struggling schools report for elementary and middle schools	May 15, 2010
Noncohort "growth" modeling for grades and subjects where performance level change is not measured	August 15, 2010

Comparison of high schools to statewide progress	August 15, 2010
Struggling schools report for high schools	August 31, 2010

Descriptor (d)(1): Provide the definition of "persistently lowest-achieving schools" (consistent with the requirements for defining this term set forth in the Definitions section of the NFR) that the State uses to identify such schools.

Indicator (d)(3): Provide, for the State, the number and identity of the schools that are Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring, that are identified as persistently lowest-achieving schools.

Indicator (d)(5): Provide, for the State, the number and identity of the schools that are secondary schools that are eligible for but do not receive, Title I funds, that are identified as persistently lowest-achieving schools.

Element	Collection (check if applies)	Public Reporting (check if applies)
Descriptor (d)(1)		X
Indicator (d)(3)		X
Indicator (d)(5)		X

We will consult with the U.S. Department of Education in the coming weeks in the development of an approvable definition of persistently lowest-achieving schools as part of our application for funding under the School Improvement Grant program. Within 15 days of being notified that the Department has approved our definition, we will make that definition publicly available at http://www.michigan.gov/mde/0,1607,7-140-6530_30334_51051-228482--,00.html .

Within 15 days of being notified that the Department has approved our definition of persistently lowest-achieving schools, we will also update or provide, as applicable, our response to Indicator (d)(3) and Indicator (d)(5).

Process for Development/Implementation

Describe the process that the state will use for developing and implementing means to collect or publicly report the required information as soon as possible but no later than September 30, 2011.

- The state already collects the data to identify the lowest achieving schools. State legislation was signed by the governor on January 4, 2010. The definition will be finalized and placed on the state website owned by the Office of Educational Improvement and Innovation (OEII) in February 2010. The business rules for identifying the persistently lowest achieving schools will be published along with the Struggling Schools Report and linked to the following Web pages: ARRA Web page (http://www.michigan.gov/mde/0,1607,7-140-37818_53083---,00.html), the School Report Card Web page (https://oeaa.state.mi.us/ayp/), and the AYP report Web page (http://www.michigan.gov/mde/0,1607,7-140-22709_22875---,00.html). The draft business rules are provided in descriptor (d)(1).
- Two offices within the Michigan Department of Education (MDE) will be responsible for implementation—Office of Education Improvement and Innovation and Office of Educational Assessment and Accountability.
- MDE expects to publish this data no later than March 2010.
- This report will be published annually.

Technical Assistance Requirements

Describe any technical assistance or support that the state will need for development and implementing the means to collect or publicly report the required information.

No technical assistance needed.

Public Reporting

Describe the public reporting around the development and implementation of the means to collect or publicly report the required information.

See above. Reports will be posted on MDE website for progress reporting.
http://www.michigan.gov/mde/0,1607,7-140-6530_30334_51051-228482--,00.html

Budget

Create a budget for the development and implementation, and oversight. Indicate whether funds will be federal, state, local, or a combination.

Task	Budget Amount	Federal/State/Local
Development	$1200	Federal
Implementation	$800	Federal
Oversight	$1200	Federal

Timeline

Use the chart below to describe key tasks and milestones that the state will use to measure progress and the estimated completion date of each task.

Key Tasks and Milestones	Estimated Completion Date
Develop description of lowest achieving schools and publish business rules	February 2010
Publish list of lowest achieving schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring.	March 2010
Publish list of lowest achieving secondary schools that are eligible for but not receiving Title I funds and secondary schools that are not eligible for Title I funds	March 2010

Indicator (d)(4): Provide, for the State, of the persistently lowest-achieving schools that are Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring, the number and identity of those schools that have been turned around, restarted, closed, or transformed (as defined in the NFR) in the last year.

Indicator (d)(6): Provide, for the State, of the persistently lowest-achieving schools that are secondary schools that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I funds, the number and identity of those schools that have been turned around, restarted, closed, or transformed in the last year.

Plan Element Verification

Element	Collection (check if applies)	Public Reporting (check if applies)
Indicator (d)(4)		X
Indicator (d)(6)		X

Within 15 days of being notified that the Department has approved our definition of persistently lowest-achieving schools, we will also update or provide, as applicable, our response to Indicator (d)(4) and Indicator (d)(6).

Process for Development/Implementation

Describe the process that the state will use for developing and implementing means to collect or publicly report the required information as soon as possible but no later than September 30, 2011.

- Indicators (d)(4) and (d)(6) require the SEA to report on the number and identity of the persistently lowest achieving schools that have been turned around, restarted, closed, or transformed in the last year. These four designations have not been widely used or closely defined prior to the State Fiscal Stabilization Fund, Race to the Top, and Title I School Improvement grant notices. MDE will begin using these designations with the Title I School Improvement Grant LEA applications and awards and will issue an annual public report following the 2010–11 school year as a progress report on Struggling Schools.
- Within MDE, the office responsible for development of the Struggling Schools report and the dissemination of Title I School Improvement Grants is the Office of Education Improvement and Innovation (OEII). OEII will distribute grant application notices in May 2010 and award grants for the 2010–11 school year. As part of the monitoring process, OEII will require annual progress reports on each school using one of the four turnaround models. The annual Struggling Schools progress report will be available on the MDE website at end of August each year.
- A new Web portal will not be needed. Struggling Schools Web pages will be part of the MDE website.
- Adequate staffing is a potential barrier. Additional staff will be hired and current staff may have some of their work reprioritized to meet the deadlines.
- Outreach will be needed to introduce and explain the Struggling Schools data, information, and reports. MDE will partner with the Intermediate School Districts/Education Service Agencies and with the education organizations in the state to ensure thorough communication and outreach.

Technical Assistance Requirements

Describe any technical assistance or support that the state will need for development and implementing the means to collect or publicly report the required information.

None required. Partnerships for communication efforts described above.

Public Reporting

Describe the public reporting around the development and implementation of the means to collect or publicly report the required information.

See above. Progress reports will be posted on MDE website for progress reporting.
http://www.michigan.gov/mde/0,1607,7-140-6530_30334_51051-228482--,00.html

Budget

Create a budget for the development and implementation, and oversight. Indicate whether funds will be federal, state, local, or a combination.

Task	Budget Amount	Federal/State/Local
Development	$100,000	Federal
Implementation	$300,000	Federal
Oversight	$100,000	Federal

Timeline

Use the chart below to describe key tasks and milestones that the state will use to measure progress and the estimated completion date of each task.

Key Tasks and Milestones	Estimated Completion Date
Submit School Improvement Grant (SIG) application to U.S. Department of Education	Feb 8, 2010
Invite eligible LEAs to apply	May 15, 2010
Award SIG grants	August 2010
Collect data on turnaround models being implemented	November 2010
Receive and compile data from annual grantee reports	June 2011
Publish Struggling Schools Progress Report for grantees	August 2011

Indicator (d)(12): Indicate, for each charter school that has closed (including a school that was not reauthorized to operate) within each of the last five years, whether the closure of the school was for financial, enrollment, academic, or other reasons.

Plan Element Verification

Element	Collection (check if applies)	Public Reporting (check if applies)
Indicator (d)(12)		X

Process for Development/Implementation

Describe the process that the state will use for developing and implementing means to collect or publicly report the required information as soon as possible but no later than September 30, 2011.

- Indicator (d)(12) requires a report to include the reason for closure of a charter school: financial, enrollment, academic, or other. MDE publishes a list of closed charter schools (http://www.michigan.gov/documents/Closed_55504_7.xls) and will begin adding the reason for closure to this list for the 2009–10 school year. The SEA will also include reason for closure in the Openings, Closings, and Status Report (http://www.michigan.gov/documents/mde/New_PSA_School_Openings_2007_193242_7.pdf) that is kept up to date on the MDE website.
- Within the MDE, the Office of Education Improvement and Innovation is responsible for the publication of reports on charter schools (known as public school academies in Michigan). The report is already developed and will just need one data element added to indicate reason for school closure.

Technical Assistance Requirements

Describe any technical assistance or support that the state will need for development and implementing the means to collect or publicly report the required information.

None needed. Outreach to charter school authorizers is needed to explain new reporting requirement. Outreach to authorizers is part of OEII's regular process and procedures.

Public Reporting

Describe the public reporting around the development and implementation of the means to collect or publicly report the required information.

See above. One report is an annual report; the other is updated throughout the year.

Budget

Create a budget for the development and implementation, and oversight. Indicate whether funds will be federal, state, local, or a combination.

Task	Budget Amount	Federal/State/Local
Development	$0	N/A

Implementation	$400	Federal
Oversight	$0	N/A

Timeline

Use the chart below to describe key tasks and milestones that the state will use to measure progress and the estimated completion date of each task.

Key Tasks and Milestones	Estimated Completion Date
Reason for closure will be added to Closed Charter Schools report and to Openings, Closings, and Status report	September 2010

Indicator (b)(1): Indicate which of the 12 elements described in section 6401(e)(2)(D) of the America COMPETES Act are included in the State's statewide longitudinal data system.

Plan Element Verification

COMPETES Element	Must be addressed in plan	Does not need to be addressed in plan
1		X
2		X
3		X
4		X
5		X
6		X
7		X
8	X	
9		X
10		X
11		X
12	X	

Process for Development/Implementation

Describe the process that the state will use for developing and implementing means to collect or publicly report the required information as soon as possible but no later than September 30, 2011 by using the following questions.

- Development of the plan:
    - What actions will the state take to develop the plan?

      Plan for b(8): Michigan currently has systems in place that uniquely identify both teachers and students. The Registry of Educational Personnel (REP) collects data about teacher, administrator, and other personnel school assignments and duties, and it assigns a unique identifier for each individual. It also stores historical data on each staff member, including credentials. The Michigan Student Data System (MSDS) uniquely identifies each student enrolled in a Michigan preschool, elementary, or secondary school and collects and stores basic personal and demographic data for the student.

      Linking student data to teacher data is not currently performed at the state level in Michigan. The linkages will be constructed and implemented as part of our SLDS 2010 proposal. Unique permanent teacher, student, and course identifiers will become part of the permanent individual-level student performance records maintained in the enhanced Michigan state longitudinal data system (SLDS). Teachers will be linked to courses taught and students served. After the connections are in place at the conclusion of the SLDS 2010 work, Michigan will have the capacity to begin calculating student-growth factors for schools, classrooms, teachers, and individual students longitudinally. By linking in data on teacher assignments, credentials, and recommending institution, Michigan can begin to analyze and better understand teacher, principal, and school impacts on student performance gains.

Plan for b(12): The Michigan Department of Treasury and many university financial officers would like to leverage the SLDS to explore the impacts that financial aid packages have had on student access and success in higher education. These issues cut across the data stores of numerous agencies and are therefore difficult to address. Yet the importance of the questions and the research is clear.

Michigan's Department of Energy, Labor, and Economic Growth has already begun to implement several key strategies aimed at accelerating the transition of thousands of workers into good-paying jobs through relevant postsecondary training or education. Central to these efforts is a commitment to coordinate services among Michigan's adult education, postsecondary education, and workforce development systems. The realization of this commitment is hampered by the lack of aligned data systems that store and exchange information about the achievement of individual students and their progress through life after school. The incorporation of adult education, training, and workforce data into Michigan's SLDS will better position state and local leaders to meet the needs of our communities and their residents.

It will take substantial funding to support alignment and processes for moving, transforming, and storing these diverse data in SLDS. Michigan asked for SLDS 2010 funds to move various Michigan governmental agencies and units in this direction. These include—in addition to those already mentioned—the One-Stop Michigan Information System (workforce development), Michigan Adult Education Reporting System, Unemployment Insurance Database, Postsecondary Career Tech (Perkins IV), and others. A benefit from this alignment work will be a reduction in duplicative information collections, reliance on outmoded systems, problems caused by inflexible protocols, and siloed information assets. Significant improvement should come about in the ability of Michigan policymakers to access critical information at critical moments to support sound decisions about policy options.

- Which state agency or agencies will be responsible for the development of the plan? Michigan Department of Management and Budget-Center for Educational Performance and Information (CEPI).
- What evidence is there that the agency or agencies have the capacity to do this? CEPI developed systems to uniquely identify and track individual-level student and staff data for Michigan. The agency continues to link systems across state agencies utilizing processes to connect and use disparate data sets. In addition, CEPI is building strategic relationships with new state agency partners to identify and expand data system connections that help identify and align information useful in understanding factors that contribute to success in postsecondary education and the workforce.
- Will any additional institutional infrastructure be necessary to develop this (e.g., a new Web portal or another IT solution)? CEPI is already working on requirements gathering and preliminary planning activities related to the development of an education data mart and education data portal. The agency is leveraging IES SLDS 2009 grant funding to build the initial system with capacity to handle existing needs. The system will be designed in a way that recognizes the changing nature of the education data conversation.

- Implementation of the plan:
  - What actions will the state take to implement the plan? Project steering committee is used by the state to ensure cross-agency collaboration and oversight on progress and project outcomes.
  - How frequently will the information be collected or publicly reported? Initially, annual data analysis and reporting processes will be utilized for these reporting mandates. As needs are identified after the initial phase of system development, alterations can be explored to expand offerings.

- Which state agency or agencies will be responsible for:
    - Implementing the plan? DMB-CEPI.
    - Monitoring the implementation of the plan? DMB-CEPI, Michigan Department of Education (MDE), Michigan Department of Energy, Labor and Economic Growth (DELEG), Treasury, and the Michigan Department of Information Technology (MDIT).
- Other oversight?

  What evidence is there that these agency or agencies have the capacity to do this? Michigan has been working on the initial SLDS project scope for three years. The same state agencies have been successfully overseeing and steering efforts related to SLDS readiness projects over this time period.

Are there any other obstacles that may prevent the state from developing or executing those means by September 30, 2011 (e.g., requirements and prohibitions of state law and policy)? No.

Technical Assistance Requirements

Describe any technical assistance or support that the state will need for development and implementing the means to collect or publicly report the required information by using the following questions:

- What technical assistance or support is necessary for the development of the state plan? The Michigan Department of Information Technology (MDIT) is responsible for managing all IT contracts for the state of Michigan, and the DIT Project Management Office (PMO) has developed and implemented the DIT Project Management Methodology (PMM) to provide the necessary management controls and tools. The PMM includes the following phases: Initiation, Planning, Execution, Closeout, and Control. Control operates throughout all phases. DIT senior project managers have many years of experience and are able to manage large contracts and apply the PMM methodology and controls. The nine "knowledge areas" that the senior project managers are expected to manage during the course of the project are integration, scope, time, cost, quality, human resources, communications, risk, and procurement.
- What agencies or organizations will be providing this technical assistance or support? MDIT.
- What technical assistance or support is necessary for the implementation or oversight of the state plan? Project management, longitudinal database administration, metadata management and documentation.
    - Is any outreach or training required? Throughout the process, from requirements gathering to implementation, training plans will be developed for each new report or system functionality. Contracted training resources will be used to develop training materials and a train-the-trainer method often used by the state. Using ISD resources as conduits of information about data aspects to the local level has proven successful in past projects, and we anticipate using postsecondary associations in the same manner to disseminate training to postsecondary institutions. A particular focus of the training around this project will be in the use of the data to improve instruction, identify leaks in the education pipeline, and provide some indicators of postsecondary student success. Several methods of training media have been used in the past and will continue to be used, from narrated report walk-through video clips, context-sensitive help in applications, and detailed manuals to face-to-face training sessions and online webinars that are coordinated with our external partners.
- What agencies or organizations will be providing this technical assistance or support? MDIT, vendor teams, school district partners.

Public Reporting

Describe the public reporting around the development and implementation of the means to collect or publicly report the required information by using the following questions:

- How does the state intend to publicly report the plan? Data will be reported on the CEPI website. Later, the Michigan Education Data Portal will be used.
- How does the state intend to publicly report progress on the plan? MDE website
  - What is the nature of the progress reporting? Updates
  - How frequently will progress be reported? Quarterly
- Identify the website where the plan and progress reports will be made publicly available. http://www.michigan.gov/mde/0,1607,7-140-6530_30334_51051-228482--,00.html

Budget

Create a budget for the development and implementation, and oversight. Indicate whether funds will be federal, state, local, or a combination.

Task	Budget Amount	Federal/State/Local
Development (describe task or tasks if applicable) Connect teachers to students Integrate adult education data Integrate workforce data Integrate financial aid system data	$250,000 $250,000 $250,000 $250,000	Federal Federal State Federal
Implementation (describe task or tasks if applicable) District payments to populate data	$3,600,000	Federal
Oversight (describe task or tasks if applicable) P–20 Council	$65,000	Federal

Timeline

Use the chart below to describe key tasks and milestones that the state will use to measure progress and the estimated completion date of each task.

Key Tasks and Milestones	Estimated Completion Date
Gather necessary teacher-/student-/course-level reporting requirements	Winter 2010
Collect teacher and course data at the student level	Summer 2011
Design and implement analysis and reporting templates for teacher-to-student connection reports	Summer 2012
Gather adult education and workforce data reporting requirements	Summer 2010
Pull adult education and workforce data from available source data systems and connect to PK–12 data	Winter 2010
Convene and support P–20 Council in identifying reporting and analysis needs	Winter 2010
Identify requirements for reports related to student financial aid	Summer 2010
Design, test, and implement reports and analysis relating student financial aid to student achievement	Spring 2011

Indicator (b)(2): Indicate whether the State provides student growth data on their current students and the students they taught in the previous year to, at a minimum, teachers of reading/language arts and mathematics in grades in which the State administers assessments in those subjects in a manner that is timely and informs instructional programs.

Process for Development/Implementation

Describe the process that the state will use for developing and implementing means to collect or publicly report the required information as soon as possible but no later than September 30, 2011 by using the following questions.

- Development of the plan:
  - What actions will the state take to develop the plan? Michigan calculates growth data for the assessments the state administers in reading and mathematics but does not provide this information directly to teachers for students they taught the previous year. Michigan assesses reading and mathematics in Grades 3–8 in the fall of each year. The tests are based on the content standards that were expected to be taught to students during the prior school year. For example, the fourth-grade statewide mathematics assessments measure third-grade content. Because of this, Michigan will need to send the growth data to the teacher who was responsible for instructing the students during the prior school year. For example, after the fourth-grade mathematics assessment is administered, growth data and other information will need to be generated and provided to the teachers who were responsible for the cohort of students in third grade.

    Through the use of each student's Universal Identifier Code (UIC), the state is able to match a high percentage of students with the school where they received instruction the prior year. Michigan also has unique codes for each LEA and school building that it uses to match students to buildings for assessment reporting and other purposes. Michigan will develop and begin providing new "feeder reports" to schools beginning in fall 2011 following each assessment administration cycle at the same time as other reports are delivered. These reports will include growth data, in accordance with the growth model articulated in Michigan's approved Accountability Workbook, and allow schools to look at the collective performance of each grade's teachers. For example, Michigan has unique identifiers for teachers, called the Personnel Identification Code (PIC), and is developing the data system capability to utilize them much more broadly. Beginning in fall 2011, Michigan will have the ability to tie individual teachers to individual students, regardless of movement within the state, with a high degree of accuracy. The Michigan Department of Education (MDE) will generate reports that are solely available online to school and district leaders as well as teachers, giving them the ability to view the performance of students that they were responsible for during the prior school year. These reports will have information on the performance of all students, as well as reports showing the disaggregated performance of students with disabilities and English language learners.
  - Which state agency or agencies will be responsible for the development of the plan? The Michigan Department of Education's Office of Educational Assessment & Accountability (OEAA) and the Center for Educational Performance and Information (CEPI) will be jointly responsible for the development and implementation of the plan described above. The OEAA is responsible for the administration of all statewide assessments and the application of these results into state accountability frameworks. CEPI is statutorily authorized by the Michigan Legislature to coordinate the collection, management, and reporting of all data required by state and federal law from PK–12 educational entities and from public postsecondary institutions, and to implement a P–20 Longitudinal Data System.

- What evidence is there that the agency or agencies have the capacity to do this? The OEAA has developed and disseminated the assessment reports for all assessments required under ESEA and state legislation since it was established in 2003. As noted in the plan described above, the OEAA currently produces a variety of aggregate reports following each assessment cycle. OEAA staff are well versed in the requirements and resources needed to develop additional aggregate reports and ensure they are produced at the same time.

  As noted in the plan described above, Michigan already uses a state-issued unique identifier to connect and report (by subgroup) data from K–12 general education, special education, career and technical education, migrant education, early childhood, and assessment. Similar processes will be leveraged and enhanced by CEPI to connect these data points to postsecondary data sources.

- Will any additional institutional infrastructure be necessary to develop this (e.g., a new Web portal or another IT solution)? Michigan's Data for Student Success (D4SS) collaborative project between the SEA, ISDs, and LEAs is the prototype for building Michigan's Web-based education data portal that will provide information to schools, leaders, teachers, researchers, and the public. Michigan's SLDS will supply additional data sets to the portal and expand dynamic inquiry capabilities to allow users to examine student progress and outcomes through preschool, postsecondary, and into the workforce. These enhanced tools will ensure more efficient query capability, reporting capacity, and ultimately will result in greater transparency for taxpayers.

- Implementation of the plan:
  - What actions will the state take to implement the plan? Michigan has demonstrated repeated success by strategically following an iterative process of requirements gathering, design, prototype development, testing, automating successful prototypes for full-scale production, and deployment coupled with training and professional development. Using funding from SLDS 2009, we already have on contract a professional requirements-gathering team. We will maximize this earlier investment and design deliverables that will utilize existing infrastructure, software, systems, and tools wherever possible. During the development process, a phased approach will allow development to begin on certain system components while deliverables in subsequent phases of the project can be designed.
  - How frequently will the information be collected or publicly reported? The new reports will be developed and provided to educators and the public as soon as possible following each administration cycle. The new reports will be released at the same time as all other state assessment reports are made available.
  - Which state agency or agencies will be responsible for:
    - Implementing the plan? The Michigan Department of Education's Office of Educational Assessment & Accountability (OEAA) and the Center for Educational Performance and Information (CEPI) will be jointly responsible for the development and implementation of the plan described above.
    - Monitoring the implementation of the plan? The Michigan Department of Education's Office of Educational Assessment & Accountability (OEAA) and the Center for Educational Performance and Information (CEPI) will be jointly responsible for monitoring the implementation of the plan described above.
  - Other oversight?

    The P–20 Advisory Council will consist of representatives from the preschool, K–12, postsecondary, and other adult learner education communities, as well as the workforce and overall system support. The P–20 Advisory Council will serve as a body to resolve implementation issues escalated to it from OEAA or stakeholder groups concerned with the implementation and use of teacher and principal effectiveness measures. CEPI will coordinate the work of this group using existing SLDS 2009 grant resources.

What evidence is there that these agency or agencies have the capacity to do this? The OEAA has developed and disseminated the assessment reports for all assessments required under ESEA and state legislation since it was established in 2003. As noted in the plan described above, the OEAA currently produces a variety of aggregate reports following each assessment cycle. OEAA staff are well versed in the requirements and resources needed to develop additional aggregate reports, and ensure they are produced at the same time. In addition, coordinated by CEPI, Michigan has successfully implemented a collaborative project-oversight process to review the status of the projects, communicate successes, and manage issues related to each of the America Competes Act elements already addressed in the state.

- Will any additional institutional infrastructure be necessary to execute this (e.g., a new Web portal or another IT solution)? See above.

Are there any other obstacles that may prevent the state from developing or executing those means by September 30, 2011 (e.g., requirements and prohibitions of state law and policy)? There are no additional obstacles that would prevent the state from developing or executing the plan described above by September 30, 2011.

Technical Assistance Requirements

Describe any technical assistance or support that the state will need for development and implementing the means to collect or publicly report the required information by using the following questions:

- What technical assistance or support is necessary for the development of the state plan? The Michigan Department of Information Technology (MDIT) is responsible for managing all IT contracts for the state of Michigan, and the DIT Project Management Office (PMO) has developed and implemented the DIT Project Management Methodology (PMM) to provide the necessary management controls and tools. The PMM includes the following phases: Initiation, Planning, Execution, Closeout, and Control. Control operates throughout all phases. DIT senior project managers have many years of experience and are able to manage large contracts and apply the PMM methodology and controls. The nine “knowledge areas” that the senior project managers are expected to manage during the course of the project are integration, scope, time, cost, quality, human resources, communications, risk, and procurement.
- What agencies or organizations will be providing this technical assistance or support? MDIT.
- What technical assistance or support is necessary for the implementation or oversight of the state plan? Project management, longitudinal database administration, metadata management and documentation.
    - Is any outreach or training required? Throughout the process, from requirements gathering to implementation, training plans will be developed for each new report or system functionality. Contracted training resources will be used to develop training materials and a train-the-trainer method often used by the state. Using ISD resources as conduits of information about data aspects to the local level has proven successful in past projects, and we anticipate using postsecondary associations in the same manner to disseminate training to postsecondary institutions. A particular focus of the training around this project will be in the use of the data to improve instruction, identify leaks in the education pipeline, and provide some indicators of postsecondary student success. Several methods of training media have been used in the past and will continue to be used, from narrated report walk-through video clips, context-sensitive help in applications, and detailed manuals to face-to-face training sessions and online webinars that are coordinated with our external partners.
- What agencies or organizations will be providing this technical assistance or support? MDIT, vendor teams, school district partners.

Public Reporting

Describe the public reporting around the development and implementation of the means to collect or publicly report the required information by using the following questions:

- How does the state intend to publicly report the plan? For this item, the CEPI website will be used to provide public access. Once the education data portal is developed, that will become the access point for the public to view results.
- How does the state intend to publicly report progress on the plan? MDE website
  - What is the nature of the progress reporting? Updates
  - How frequently will progress be reported? Quarterly
- Identify the website where the plan and progress reports will be made publicly available. http://www.michigan.gov/mde/0,1607,7-140-6530_30334_51051-228482--,00.html

Budget

Create a budget for the development and implementation, and oversight. Indicate whether funds will be federal, state, local, or a combination.

Task	Budget Amount	Federal/State/Local
Development (describe task or tasks if applicable) Report requirements gathering Data analysis and report development IT system enhancements	$50,000	Federal
Implementation (describe task or tasks if applicable) System testing Report and accountability system modeling	$50,000	Federal
Oversight (describe task or tasks if applicable) P–20 Council and other stakeholder input	$25,000	Federal

Timeline

Use the chart below to describe key tasks and milestones that the state will use to measure progress and the estimated completion date of each task.

Key Tasks and Milestones	Estimated Completion Date
Gather and document all requirements for new feeder reports	Summer 2010
Report format development and stakeholder/P–20 Council input	Fall 2010
Finalize report specifications and system test requirements	Winter 2011
Report and accountability system modeling and production of impact data; feedback requested from stakeholders/P–20 Council	Spring 2011
Integrate report specifications and system requirements into project schedules for all statewide assessment programs	Summer 2011
Administer fall assessments	Fall 2011
Provide feeder reports to schools, districts, and teachers online	Spring 2012

Indicator (b)(3): Indicate whether the State provides teachers of reading/language arts and mathematics in grades in which the State administers assessments in those subjects with reports of individual teacher impact on student achievement on those assessments.

Process for Development/Implementation

Describe the process that the state will use for developing and implementing means to collect or publicly report the required information as soon as possible but no later than September 30, 2011 by using the following questions.

- Development of the plan:
  - What actions will the state take to develop the plan? As noted in the response to Indicator (b)(2), beginning in fall 2011, Michigan will have the ability to tie individual teachers to individual students, regardless of movement within the state, with a high degree of accuracy. Presently, Michigan provides Class Roster and Class Summary reports to teachers that indicated how their students performed on state assessments in reading, writing, mathematics, and science. However, as noted above, these reports only provide information for the students that happen to be with the teacher who administered the assessment (e.g., fourth grade) and not reflective of the impact of the teacher who was responsible for instruction (e.g., the students' teachers in Grade 3). Beginning in spring 2012, Michigan will use its enhanced capability to tie teachers to students to generate "Teacher Impact Reports." These reports will be designed to capture and display, to the maximum extent possible based on the number of students that can be matched via their UICs, a summary of how all students progressed for a given teacher. For example, after the fourth-grade statewide mathematics assessment is given and reports are being generated, the new Teacher Impact Report also will be created. This report will tie all of the students who are currently in fourth grade and were just tested to their third-grade teachers. The Teacher Impact Report will display performance and growth data for all students that can be matched through the student UIC and teacher PIC. The Teacher Impact Report will also display a summative chart showing the number and percentage of students that made significant progress (defined as performance level change in Michigan's approved growth model), maintained their level of performance, or displayed a decline in performance. Because it is expected that this report will have significant implications for teacher evaluations, the granting of tenure, and other high-stakes accountability applications, SEA staff will present this report and plan for its use to the State Board of Education in summer 2010 to determine what additional information should be displayed on the Teacher Impact Report and how it should be displayed in the fairest and most transparent manner.
  - Which state agency or agencies will be responsible for the development of the plan? The Michigan Department of Education's Office of Educational Assessment & Accountability (OEAA) and the Center for Educational Performance and Information (CEPI) will be jointly responsible for the development and implementation of the plan described above. The OEAA is responsible for the administration of all statewide assessments and the application of these results into state accountability frameworks. CEPI is statutorily authorized by the Michigan Legislature to coordinate the collection, management, and reporting of all data required by state and federal law from PK–12 educational entities and from public postsecondary institutions, and to implement a P–20 Longitudinal Data System.
  - What evidence is there that the agency or agencies have the capacity to do this? The OEAA has developed and disseminated the assessment reports for all assessments required under ESEA and state legislation since it was established in 2003. As noted in the plan described above, the OEAA currently produces a variety of aggregate reports following each assessment cycle. OEAA staff are well versed in the requirements and resources needed to develop additional aggregate reports and ensure they are produced at the same time.

As noted in the plan described above, Michigan already uses a state-issued unique identifier to connect and report (by subgroup) data from K–12 general education, special education, career and technical education, migrant education, early childhood, and assessment. Similar processes will be leveraged and enhanced by CEPI to connect these data points to postsecondary data sources.

- Will any additional institutional infrastructure be necessary to develop this (e.g., a new Web portal or another IT solution)? Michigan's Data for Student Success (D4SS) collaborative project between the SEA, ISDs, and LEAs is the prototype for building Michigan's Web-based education data portal that will provide information to schools, leaders, teachers, researchers, and the public. Michigan's SLDS will supply additional data sets to the portal and expand dynamic inquiry capabilities to allow users to examine student progress and outcomes through preschool, postsecondary, and into the workforce. These enhanced tools will ensure more efficient query capability, reporting capacity, and ultimately will result in greater transparency for taxpayers.

- Implementation of the plan:
  - What actions will the state take to implement the plan? Michigan has demonstrated repeated success by strategically following an iterative process of requirements gathering, design, prototype development, testing, automating successful prototypes for full-scale production, and deployment coupled with training and professional development. Using funding from SLDS 2009, we already have on contract a professional requirements-gathering team. We will maximize this earlier investment and design deliverables that will utilize existing infrastructure, software, systems, and tools wherever possible. During the development process, a phased approach will allow development to begin on certain system components while deliverables in subsequent phases of the project can be designed.
  - How frequently will the information be collected or publicly reported? The new reports will be developed and provided to educators and the public as soon as possible following each administration cycle. The new reports will be released at the same time as all other state assessment reports are made available.
  - Which state agency or agencies will be responsible for:
    - Implementing the plan? The Michigan Department of Education's Office of Educational Assessment & Accountability (OEAA) and the Center for Educational Performance and Information (CEPI) will be jointly responsible for the development and implementation of the plan described above.
    - Monitoring the implementation of the plan? The Michigan Department of Education's Office of Educational Assessment & Accountability (OEAA) and the Center for Educational Performance and Information (CEPI) will be jointly responsible for monitoring the implementation of the plan described above.
  - Other oversight?

    The P–20 Advisory Council will consist of representatives from the preschool, K–12, postsecondary, and other adult learner education communities, as well as the workforce and overall system support. The P–20 Advisory Council will serve as a body to resolve implementation issues escalated to it from OEAA or stakeholder groups concerned with the implementation and use of teacher and principal effectiveness measures. CEPI will coordinate the work of this group using existing SLDS 2009 grant resources.

    What evidence is there that these agency or agencies have the capacity to do this? The OEAA has developed and disseminated the assessment reports for all assessments required under ESEA and state legislation since it was established in 2003. As noted in the plan described above, the OEAA currently produces a variety of aggregate reports following each assessment cycle. OEAA staff are well versed in the requirements and resources needed to develop additional aggregate reports, and ensure they are produced at the same time. In addition, coordinated by CEPI, Michigan has successfully implemented a collaborative project-oversight process to review the status of the projects, communicate successes, and manage issues related to each of the America Competes Act elements already addressed in the state.

- Will any additional institutional infrastructure be necessary to execute this (e.g., a new Web portal or another IT solution)? See above.

Are there any other obstacles that may prevent the state from developing or executing those means by September 30, 2011 (e.g., requirements and prohibitions of state law and policy)? There are no additional obstacles that would prevent the state from developing or executing the plan described above by September 30, 2011.

Technical Assistance Requirements

Describe any technical assistance or support that the state will need for development and implementing the means to collect or publicly report the required information by using the following questions:

- What technical assistance or support is necessary for the development of the state plan? The Michigan Department of Information Technology (MDIT) is responsible for managing all IT contracts for the state of Michigan, and the DIT Project Management Office (PMO) has developed and implemented the DIT Project Management Methodology (PMM) to provide the necessary management controls and tools. The PMM includes the following phases: Initiation, Planning, Execution, Closeout, and Control. Control operates throughout all phases. DIT senior project managers have many years of experience and are able to manage large contracts and apply the PMM methodology and controls. The nine “knowledge areas” that the senior project managers are expected to manage during the course of the project are integration, scope, time, cost, quality, human resources, communications, risk, and procurement.
- What agencies or organizations will be providing this technical assistance or support? MDIT.
- What technical assistance or support is necessary for the implementation or oversight of the state plan? Project management, longitudinal database administration, metadata management and documentation.
  - Is any outreach or training required? Throughout the process, from requirements gathering to implementation, training plans will be developed for each new report or system functionality. Contracted training resources will be used to develop training materials and a train-the-trainer method often used by the state. Using ISD resources as conduits of information about data aspects to the local level has proven successful in past projects, and we anticipate using professional education associations, ISDs, and LEAs in the same manner to disseminate training to postsecondary institutions. A particular focus of the training around this project will be in the use of the data to improve instruction, identify leaks in the education pipeline, and provide some indicators of postsecondary student success. Several methods of training media have been used in the past and will continue to be used, from narrated report walk-through video clips, context-sensitive help in applications, and detailed manuals to face-to-face training sessions and online webinars that are coordinated with our external partners.
- What agencies or organizations will be providing this technical assistance or support? MDIT, vendor teams, school district partners, state educator association organizations.

Public Reporting

Describe the public reporting around the development and implementation of the means to collect or publicly report the required information by using the following questions:

- How does the state intend to publicly report the plan? For this item, the CEPI website will be used to provide public access. Once the education data portal is developed, that will become the access point for the public to view results.
- How does the state intend to publicly report progress on the plan? MDE website
  - What is the nature of the progress reporting? Updates
  - How frequently will progress be reported? Quarterly
- Identify the website where the plan and progress reports will be made publicly available. http://www.michigan.gov/mde/0,1607,7-140-6530_30334_51051-228482--,00.html

Budget

Create a budget for the development and implementation, and oversight. Indicate whether funds will be federal, state, local, or a combination.

Task	Budget Amount	Federal/State/Local
Development (describe task or tasks if applicable) Report requirements gathering Data analysis and report development IT system enhancements	$50,000	Federal
Implementation (describe task or tasks if applicable) System testing Report and accountability system modeling	$50,000	Federal
Oversight (describe task or tasks if applicable) P–20 Council and other stakeholder input	$25,000	Federal

Timeline

Use the chart below to describe key tasks and milestones that the state will use to measure progress and the estimated completion date of each task.

Key Tasks and Milestones	Estimated Completion Date
Gather and document all requirements for new teacher impact reports	Summer 2010
Report format development and stakeholder/P–20 Council input	Fall 2010
Finalize report specifications and system test requirements	Winter 2011
Report and accountability system modeling and production of impact data; feedback requested from stakeholders/P–20 Council	Spring 2011
Integrate report specifications and system requirements into project schedules for all statewide assessment programs	Summer 2011
Administer fall assessments	Fall 2011
Provide teacher impact reports to schools, districts, and teachers online	Spring 2012

PART 3C-- GENERAL REQUIREMENTS

Please attach the following information—

(1) Describe the processes the State employs to review and verify the required data and other information on the indicators and descriptors.

For source data collected by the Center for Educational Performance and Information (CEPI), the office employs numerous edit checks and error-trapping routines, online and offline, and provides school districts with preaudit reports to check data values. One example is an application that allows local education agencies (LEAs) to request historical corrections to graduating cohort status data; auditors approve or deny the corrections on the basis of evidence presented by the LEA. Another example is a series of Statistical Applications of the Sciences (SAS) analytical procedures that perform 185 individual quality checks on a single submission of teacher data. Michigan selected a scalable infrastructure for its SAS implementation so that its use as a data quality and analysis tool can expand greatly as our state longitudinal data system (SLDS) is put into place. Michigan agencies will extend such uniform quality assurance procedures to its automated extraction, transformation, and loading (ETL) and reporting processes as data are transferred to and from the SLDS. We need SLDS 2010 funding to accomplish this goal to the extent we are planning under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) series of programs.

Validity and value are functions of data and of their use: Quality data that do not help to enable sound decision making are of little use. Although the Michigan Department of Education (MDE) and CEPI both stress that data quality can always be improved, the Data Quality Campaign cites Michigan's PK–12 data audit capacity as meeting five criteria for quality, validity, and reliability. As data from disparate sources across Michigan are shared and interconnect, quality varies significantly among emerging partners. Some systems do not follow standard definitions or business rules, lack reliable error checking, and may not have systemic processes in place to ensure data quality. Michigan requires resources to investigate the breadth and depth of problems in this regard and to structure appropriate responses to ensure quality data and consistent procedures throughout the whole SLDS partnership.

For the assessment data gathered by the Michigan Department of Education (MDE) Office of Educational Assessment & Accountability (OEAA), the following checks are in place to assure reliability, validity, and accuracy of the data:

- Integral educator involvement in the development of test questions, with high-quality training
- Integral educator involvement in review of test questions for bias, sensitivity, and content appropriateness both before and after field testing
- Contractor and in-house psychometric review of items to be placed on the assessments
- Contractor and in-house psychometric review of field test data
- Contractor, in-house, and independent psychometric review of operational test data to ensure accurate item keys and item scoring and to ensure that any poorly performing items are either fixed or dropped
- Contractor, in-house, and independent psychometric analysis of scaling, equating, and reported results to assure accurate and thorough application of all psychometric processes
- Contractor and in-house systematic, thorough quality assurance testing using mock data and live data on scanning, scoring, and reporting systems following a single stream of data from end to end

- Release of the embargoed data file to local schools and districts far in advance of public release to ensure that any problems that may have slipped through all of the quality assurance tests are addressed before public release and high-stakes use

The MDE Office of Education Improvement and Innovation (OEII) uses standard monitoring and reporting processes to verify data submitted by local school districts. Frequent monitoring of grant recipients will help to ensure accuracy. Data that pertain to schools that are collected through the Center for Education Performance and Information (CEPI) and the Office of Educational Assessment and Accountability (OEAA) undergo validity decisions as described above.

The Office of Professional Preparation Services (OPPS) works with CEPI and DIT to run an audit of the educator licensure data submitted through the REP with the License 2000 (L2K) database to verify that teachers are appropriately certificated and assigned to teach in their areas of certification. The L2K database and the REP data collection provide a reliable source for verifying the data needed for the various indicators and descriptors. If discrepancies occur, local districts are informed and are required to submit supporting documentation of the teacher's credentials. If local districts cannot provide the documentation, they are directed to terminate the noncertificated teacher. OPPS also implemented the Michigan Technical Assistance Project (MITAP) in response to ensuring 100 percent highly qualified teachers as required by the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act. OPPS contracts with qualified educators to review the REP reports and monitor, over time, every LEA in the state and follow up with them on their state plans to employ highly qualified teachers and ensure equitable distributions of these teachers. MDE and OPPS received a commendation for the implementation of the MITAP project from the U.S. Department of Education.

(2) Describe the processes the State employs to ensure that, consistent with 34 CFR 99.31(b), the required data and other information are not made publicly available in a manner that personally identifies students, where applicable.

The Michigan Department of Education (MDE) and the Center for Educational Performance and Information (CEPI) teams employ several actions to ensure that only authorized users can access and use personally identifiable information. The state uses secure socket layering (SSL) technology in the movement of confidential data in its collection applications and ensures that encryption is utilized on both incoming and outgoing data exchange processes. When data are requested for research purposes, the state convenes a research review panel to discuss and weigh the education merits of the educational study request. The panel requires that the requester follow standard human subject review protocols with a research entity (e.g., university review board, private research review board, peer review board) prior to submitting a request to the state and then closely scrutinizes the study to ensure that only appropriate data elements are requested and that uses are clearly defined. The state utilizes a research ID on every record to add further anonymity to the individual-level information even though the state does have a state-issued unique identifier for every student. In addition, the state uses and requires others to use a minimum "n-factor" (10) in all aggregations and reports to ensure that individual identities are not compromised incidentally.

Although the MDE Office of Educational Assessment & Accountability (OEAA) does provide reports with fewer than 10 students, schools are clearly notified that such reports contain confidential student information protected by FERPA and should not be shared with the public. The reports themselves also contain this notice. Any reports that are publicly available do maintain the <10 confidentiality restriction, with any results for a cell with less than 10 students being suppressed.

STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT

Broad outreach was conducted to raise awareness of the enhanced requirements for submitting the State Fiscal Stabilization Fund Phase II Application and provide stakeholders with an opportunity to raise questions and submit feedback. Informational meetings were held throughout the state for over 550 superintendents, teachers, principals, school board members, community leaders, administrators and parents.

The State Fiscal Stabilization Fund Phase II Application was discussed, including how the application process differed between Phase I and Phase II, the additional data required for Phase II and the application due date. The coordination between multiple state entities and the integration of Race to the Top Application requirements, with other initiatives, were also discussed. Opportunities were available during the meetings for participants to present questions and provide feedback.

ATTACHMENT A

PART 2A, UPDATE OF MAINTENANCE-OF-EFFORT BASELINE DATA

3. Additional Submission Requirements:

(a) Identify and describe the data sources used in determining the levels of State support for elementary and secondary education

	FY2006 **MOE Level**	**FY2009 Unaudited Financial Statements**	**FY2010** **Enacted** **PA 121 of '09**	**FY2011** **Est. Available Revenues**
Total State School Aid Spending	11,320,239,000	11,049,155,510	10,771,811,600	10,705,040,600
Pupil FTEs	1,697,558	1,619,797	1,597,245	1,580,000
Per Pupil State MOE	6,669	6,821	6,744	6,775

Michigan will comply with the elementary and secondary education MOE requirements on a per pupil basis, using total state school aid spending divided by the number of pupil FTEs funded in the relevant fiscal year. Funding sources for elementary and secondary education are from the dedicated revenues in the State School Aid Fund and the state's General Fund.

For FY2006, total state school aid spending is available in the State of Michigan Comprehensive Annual Financial Report for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006. Funded pupil counts are available from the State Aid Management System, maintained by the Michigan Department of Education for the purpose of calculating state school aid payments.

For FY2009, total state school aid spending is based on preliminary unaudited financial statements of the School Aid Fund for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2009, that was submitted to the legislature on December 28, 2009. Final, audited financial statements will be included in the State of Michigan Comprehensive Annual Financial Report, which is scheduled to be available in March 2010. Funded pupil counts are available from the State Aid Management System, maintained by the Michigan Department of Education for the purpose of calculating state school aid payments.

For FY2010, total state school aid spending is based upon the enacted state school aid budget for the current fiscal year (PA 121 of 2009). Funded pupil FTE are available from the State Aid Management System, maintained by the Michigan Department of Education for the purpose of calculating state school aid payments.

For FY2011, total state school aid spending and funded FTE are preliminary planning estimates currently being used by the State Budget Office for development of the FY2011 Executive Budget Recommendation.

(b) Identify and describe the data sources used in determining the levels of State support for public IHEs.

	FY2006 MOE Level	**FY2009 Unaudited Financial Statements**	**FY2010 Enacted Budgets**	**FY2011 Maintenance**
Community Colleges & Universities Operations	1,756,929,700	1,823,764,100	1,749,198,300	1,817,436,300
Est. State Research Spending	(86,396,750)	(89,347,142)	(71,381,478)	(88,982,188)
State MOE	1,670,532,950	1,734,416,958	1,677,816,822	1,728,454,11 2

Michigan will comply with the higher education MOE requirements using operations funding for public community colleges and universities operations, as adjusted by State Budget Office estimates of unspecified state-funded research reports (required by #8 of the Governing Principles for determining State Support for Public Institutions of Higher Education, contained in the Guidance on the Maintenance-of-Effort Requirements in the State Fiscal Stabilization Fund Program document dated May 1, 2009.).

FY2006 actual community college and university operations costs are obtained from the FY2006 Final Fourth Quarter Financial Report, prepared by the Fiscal Management Division of the Department of Management and Budget. The adjustment for unspecified state-funded research is estimated by the State Budget Office using data reported by the institutions to the state's Higher Education Institutional Data Inventory (HEIDI) database and based on the state's share of total universities' general fund revenues. The change in the FY2006 MOE level from the original submission is due to updated data reported by state universities.

FY2009 community college and university operations cost are obtained from the FY2009 Final Financial Report, prepared by the Fiscal Management Division of the Department of Management and Budget. The adjustment for unspecified state funded research is based upon the percentage change in state spending for university operations between FY2006 and FY2009.

FY2010 university operations funding is contained in Public Act 132 of 2009. Community colleges operations support is contained in Public Act 111 of 2009. The adjustment for unspecified state funded research is based upon the percentage change in state spending for university operations between FY2006 and FY2010.

FY2011 university and community college operations support are assumed to continue the total FY2010 funding amounts appropriated for community colleges operations in Public Act 111 of 2009 and for university operations in Public Act 132 of 2009. The adjustment for unspecified state funded research is based upon the percentage change in state spending for university operations between FY2006 and FY2011.

ATTACHMENT B

Teacher and Administrator Performance Evaluation Systems Survey

Created: December 03 2009, 12:50 PM
Last Modified: December 03 2009, 12:50 PM
Design Theme: Basic Blue
Language: English
Button Options: Labels
Disable Browser "Back" Button: False

Teacher and Administrator Performance Evaluation Systems Survey

Page 1 - Heading

Please provide the following demographic information.

Page 1 - Question 1 - Open Ended - One Line [Mandatory]

Your Name:

Page 1 - Question 2 - Choice - One Answer (Bullets) [Mandatory]

Position/Title:

- ❍ Superintendent
- ❍ Assistant Superintendent
- ❍ Human Resource Director
- ❍ Principal
- ❍ Assistant Principal
- ❍ Technician
- ❍ Administrative Assistant
- ❍ Other, please specify

Page 1 - Question 3 - Choice - One Answer (Drop Down) [Mandatory]

Name of LEA/ISD/PSA

[List of LEAs, ISDs, and PSAs]

Page 1 - Question 4 - Choice - One Answer (Bullets) [Mandatory]

Type of Agency/Organization

- ❍ Local School District (LEA)
- ❍ ISD
- ❍ PSA

Page 2 - Question 5 - Choice - Multiple Answers (Bullets)

For which of the following types of staff does your agency conduct annual performance evaluations. (check all that apply)

- ❑ Nontenured (probationary teachers)
- ❑ Tenured teachers
- ❑ Building principals
- ❑ Superintendent

Page 2 - Question 6 - Choice - Multiple Answers (Bullets)

For which of the following types of staff does your agency include data on student achievement growth as a significant factor in the evaluation process. (check all that apply)

- ❑ Nontenured teacher performance evaluations
- ❑ Tenured teacher performance evaluations
- ❑ Principal performance evaluations
- ❑ Superintendent performance evaluations

Page 2 - Question 7 - Choice - One Answer (Bullets) [Mandatory]

How is student achievement growth data measured for use in performance evaluations?

- ❍ Not applicable (not considered in performance evaluations)
- ❍ As a statistic from test data
- ❍ As a subjective rating from the supervisor
- ❍ Other, please specify

Page 2 - Question 8 - Choice - One Answer (Bullets) [Mandatory]

How is student achievement growth data incorporated into performance evaluations?

- ❍ Not applicable (not considered in performance evaluations)
- ❍ In a prescribed way (e.g., formula driven)
- ❍ Subjectively by the supervisor
- ❍ Other, please specify

Page 2 - Question 9 - Choice - One Answer (Bullets) [Mandatory]

How important is student achievement growth data in the results of performance evaluations?

- ❍ Not applicable (not considered in performance evaluations)
- ❍ A minor factor
- ❍ An important factor
- ❍ A major factor

Page 2 - Question 10 - Yes or No [Mandatory]

The state reports, for each student in Grades 4–8, a Performance Level Change (a measure of student growth) in reading and mathematics.
Does your district make use of the Performance Level Change designation by the state?

- ❍ Yes
- ❍ No

Page 2 - Question 11 - Choice - Multiple Answers (Bullets) [Mandatory]

For which subjects do you develop measures of student growth? (check all that apply)

- ❑ Reading
- ❑ Writing
- ❑ Mathematics
- ❑ Science
- ❑ Social Studies
- ❑ Other, please specify

Page 2 - Question 12 - Choice - Multiple Answers (Bullets)

For what grades do you develop measures of student growth? (check all that apply)

- ❑ K
- ❑ 1
- ❑ 2
- ❑ 3
- ❑ 4
- ❑ 5
- ❑ 6
- ❑ 7
- ❑ 8
- ❑ 9
- ❑ 10
- ❑ 11
- ❑ 12

Page 2 - Question 13 - Open Ended - Comments Box [Mandatory]

If you do use measures of student growth (either state-provided or locally developed), how do you use them?

Page 2 - Question 14 - Open Ended - Comments Box [Mandatory]

List the levels/ratings contained in your performance evaluation system (example: poor, fair, satisfactory, outstanding).
Please separate the levels in the list using commas.

Page 3 - Heading

The following question pertains to NONTENURED TEACHER performance evaluations.

Page 3 - Question 15 - Choice - Multiple Answers (Bullets) [Mandatory]

What types of decisions are informed by the nontenured teacher performance evaluation system? (check all that apply)

- ❑ Providing coaching
- ❑ Providing induction support
- ❑ Providing professional development

- Additional compensation
- Promotion
- Granting tenure
- Removal/termination after being given time to improve
- Other, please specify

Page 3 - Heading

The following question pertains to TENURED TEACHER Performance Evaluations.

Page 3 - Question 16 - Choice - Multiple Answers (Bullets) [Mandatory]

What types of decisions are informed by the tenured teacher performance evaluation system? (check all that apply)

- Providing coaching
- Providing induction support
- Providing professional development
- Additional compensation
- Promotion
- Granting tenure
- Removal/termination after being given time to improve
- Other, please specify

Page 3 - Heading

The following question pertains to PRINCIPAL Performance Evaluations.

Page 3 - Question 17 - Choice - Multiple Answers (Bullets) [Mandatory]

What types of decisions are informed by the principal performance evaluation system? (check all that apply)

- Providing coaching
- Providing induction support
- Providing professional development
- Additional compensation
- Promotion
- Removal/termination after being given time to improve
- Other, please specify

Page 3 - Heading

The following question pertains to SUPERINTENDENT Performance Evaluations.

Page 3 - Question 18 - Choice - Multiple Answers (Bullets) [Mandatory]

What types of decisions are informed by the superintendent performance evaluation system? (check all that apply)

- Providing coaching
- Providing induction support
- Providing professional development
- Additional compensation

- ❑ Promotion
- ❑ Removal/termination after being given time to improve
- ❑ Other, please specify

Page 3 - Question 19 - Choice - Multiple Answers (Bullets)

For which staff does your agency publicly report the results of performance evaluations? (check all that apply)

- ❑ Nontenured teachers
- ❑ Tenured teachers
- ❑ Principals
- ❑ Superintendents

Page 3 - Question 20 - Choice - Multiple Answers (Bullets) [Mandatory]

For any performance evaluation made public, how are results of the performance evaluation reported? (check all that apply)

- ❑ On the agency's website
- ❑ Written notice to the general public
- ❑ Annual written report
- ❑ Not applicable (results are not made public)
- ❑ Other, please specify

State Fiscal Stabilization Phase II

When submitting the Phase II application, please provide the indicator or descriptor the State has amended.

Indicator/Descriptor	**Date Amended**
Indicator (a)(1)	2/26/10
Indicator (c)(1)	2/9/10
Indicator (c)(2)	2/9/10
Indicator (c)(3)	2/9/10
Indicator (c)(4)	2/26/10
Indicator (c)(5)	2/9/10
Indicator (c)(6)	2/26/10
Indicator (c)(7)	2/9/10
Indicator (c)(10)	2/9/10
Indicator (d)(7)	2/26/10
Indicator (d)(8)	2/26/10
Descriptor (a)(1)	2/9/10
Indicator (a)(3)	2/9/10
Indicator (a)(4)	2/9/10
Indicator (a)(5)	2/9/10
Descriptor (a)(2)	2/9/10
Indicator (a)(6)	2/9/10
Indicator (a)(7)	2/9/10
Indicator (c)(8)	2/9/10
Indicator (c)(11)	2/26/10
Indicator (c)(12)	2/26/10
Descriptor (d)(1)	3/3/10
Indicator (d)(3)	3/3/10
Indicator (d)(4)	3/3/10
Indicator (d)(5)	3/3/10
Indicator (d)(6)	3/3/10